The expression of predicative Possession in Belarusian and Lithuanian

Lidia Federica Mazzitelli

Università degli Studi di Roma "La Sapienza"

Johannes-Gutenberg Universität Mainz

Table of contents

Part II

Predicative Possession in Belarusian and Lithuanian

Chapter 3. Belarusian and Lithuanian in context 54

Chapter 4. The sources of the data: the Belarusian and the Lithuanian corpus 75

Chapter 5. The source schemas and their realization in Belarusian and Lithuanian 80

List of abbreviations

1   first person

2   second person

3   third person

ACC   accusative

ADESS   adessive

ADVERBIAL   adverbial

COMP   complementizer

COND   conditional

DAT   dative

DEF   definite

F   feminine

FUT   future

GEN   genitive

GER   gerund

IMP   imperative

INF   infinitive

INS   instrumental

ITER   iterative

LOC   locative

M   masculine

N   neuter

NEG   negation

NOM   nominative

NP   noun phrase

PaPA   past participle active

PART   particle

PRN   pronoun

PST   past

PE   Possessee

PGER   past gerund

PL   plural

PPA   present participle active

PPP   past participle passive

PR   Possessor

PRED predicate

PRS   present

REFL reflexive

REL   relative

SG   singular

Q   question particle

VOC   vocative

Dear Wormwood,

[…] the sense of ownership in general is always to be encouraged. The humans are always putting up claims to ownership which sound equally funny in Heaven and in Hell and we [the devils] must keep them doing so. […] We produce this sense of ownership not only by pride but by confusion. We teach them not to notice the different senses of the possessive pronoun—the finely graded differences that run from "my boots" through "my dog", "my servant", "my wife", "my father", "my master" and "my country", to "my God". They can be taught to reduce all these senses to that of "my boots", the "my" of ownership. Even in the nursery a child can be taught to mean by "my Teddy-bear" not the old imagined recipient of affection to whom it stands in a special relation (for that is what the Enemy [God] will teach them to mean if we are not careful) but "the bear I can pull to pieces if I like".
And at the other end of the scale, we have taught men to say "My God" in a sense not really very different from "My boots", meaning "The God on whom I have a claim for my distinguished services and whom I exploit from the pulpit—the God I have done a corner in".
And all the time the joke is that the word "Mine" in its fully possessive sense cannot be uttered by a human being about anything. In the long run either Our Father [the devil] or the Enemy [God] will say "Mine" of each thing that exists, and specially of each man. They will find out in the end, never fear, to whom their time, their souls, and their bodies really belong—certainly not to them, whatever happens.

Your affectionate uncle,

SCREWTAPE

(C. S. Lewis, *The Screwtape Letters*)

Introduction

(i) The object of this work: the expression of predicative Possession in the Belarusian and Lithuanian context

The main aim of this work is to elucidate how Belarusian and Lithuanian express predicative Possession: that is, it aims at presenting and analysing the syntactic means these two languages use to encode the possessive relation at the sentential level.

Secondly, it also aims at analysing the role that the verbs for 'have'(*turėti* in Lithuanian and *mec'* in Belarusian) fulfil in these two languages, with particular regard to their non-possessive functions.

The topic of the expression of Possession in the languages of the world cannot be described as underestimated, or underanalysed. Many works, some of which fundamental, have already been written on this subject, both with reference to general typology (*inter alia*, Seiler 1983, Heine 1997, Stassen 2009) and to Slavic and Baltic in particular (*inter alia,* Kalnyn' and Mološnaja 1986, Clancy 2010). However, Belarusian and Lithuanian have only rarely been the objects of a systematic analysis (exceptions are the works by Činčlej (1990), which is dedicated to Lithuanian and that will frequently be referred to in this study, and by Maroz (2001), dedicated to Belarusian). Furthermore, as far as I could verify, no major studies have been produced on the topic of the non-possessive functions of the verb *mec'* 'have' in Belarusian. Hence, the interest of examining deeper these two languages with regard to our topic.

Apart from this, Belarusian and Lithuanian are of particular interest in a research about the subject of the expression of Possession because of the areal context they are inserted in. In fact, these two languages are located in an area, that could be defined as transitional: the languages spoken in the regions east of the Lithuanian and Belarusian territories (Russian, Latvian, Finnic languages) are 'be'-languages, whereas the languages spoken in the West (basically Polish, but also, in a wider context, Czech and German) are 'have' languages[1].

Now, it can be supposed that the areal context has influenced Belarusian and Lithuanian, and that these two languages have accepted the stimuli of both tendencies – to use a 'be' or a 'have' construction to express Possession-, either one of which has prevailed in the neighbouring languages. That means, it can be supposed, that Belarusian and Lithuanian may use both a 'be' and a 'have' strategy for the expression of Possession. This hypothesis finds a confirmation in the

---

[1] The label 'be' and 'have' language is taken from Isačenko (1974). With the label 'be'-languages Isačenko identifies languages that use constructions based on a 'be'-predicate (like Russian adessive construction *u menja est'* 'at me is = I have'), contraposing to 'have'-languages, where a 'have'-verb is used (like English *have,* German *haben*).

reality: in Belarusian and Lithuanian, even if to a different extent, both a 'have' verb and some 'be'-based possessive strategies are found.

Belarusian may either use a 'have'-verb, *mec'*, or an adessive, 'be'-based, construction: however, as it will be shown in this work, these two constructions are not always synonymic and interchangeable with one another. Basing his claim on this fact, Isačenko defines Belarusian as being in a "state of transition" between the 'be' and the 'have' languages (Isačenko 1974:44). Undoubtedly, Belarusian is a transitional, or mixed, language – as it corresponds to the profile of both a 'be' and a 'have' language -: however, I do not agree with Isačenko's claim, that this state of affaires should be ascribed to the influence of Polish (*ibid*.:73). Belarusian, actually, has inherited its 'have' verb from Common Slavic – thus it is *per se* a 'have' language. Rather, the influence of Polish has, most probably, helped in preserving the inherited 'have', *contra* what happened in Russian.

In the same paper, Isačenko defines instead Lithuanian as a 'have' language (*ibid*.:44). And, really, Lithuanian uses a 'have'-verb, *turėti*, as its principal strategy for the expression of Possession, as it will be thoroughly shown in the following chapters. However, even the usage of *turėti* presents significant restrictions: for instance, it is generally disliked in expressions such as 'I have blue eyes' or 'I have the flu'. In these cases, 'be'-based constructions (with the dative case or the genitive case) are preferred. In colloquial Lithuanian, moreover, the use of an adessive construction, *pas mane yra* 'at me is = I have', can be found (even if this construction has most probably arisen due to the influence of Russian). In the light of these facts, Isačenko's definition of Lithuanian as of a 'have' language seems to be not completely adherent to the reality. Rather, as Činčlej (1990:141) claims, Lithuanian should also be considered as a transitional language. The hypothesis that this work will try to confirm is that Činčlej's claim is right: both Belarusian and Lithuanian, even if to a different extent, are transitional between the 'have' and the 'be' languages.

In this work I have followed a typological approach. That is, I have analysed the Belarusian and Lithuanian material, using the criteria individuated by the typological research on the topic of the expression of predicative Possession in the languages of the world.

In particular, I have followed the model proposed by Heine (1997). Heine claims that all possessive constructions, in any human language, are derived from what he labels as 'source schemas'. These schemas (Action, Location, Accompaniment, Goal, Topic, Source, Genitive and Equation) should be understood first of all as cognitive patterns. That means, that languages cognitively represent the concept of "possessing" as the "result of an action" (Action schema), as "something being located somewhere" (Location schema), and so forth.

The source schemas represent also a model of the grammaticalization paths languages use to derive their possessive constructions. For instance, a language can grammaticalize a verb meaning 'hold' or 'catch' into a possessive verb" (Action schema), or a locative construction into a possessive one (Location schema). Belarusian has chosen the latter option, and it has grammaticalized an originally adessive preposition, *u* 'at', into a means of expression of Possession: *u mjane ësc'* 'at me is' = 'I have', which is a clear instance of the Location schema. English, conversely, has grammaticalized a verb with an original meaning of 'hold' into its major possessive strategy, the verb *have*, following, thus, the Action schema.

Since the number of the source schemas is limited, the number of derivation patterns for possessive constructions in the languages of the world is limited as well. One language may express Possession through an originally locative or agentive construction, as Belarusian and English do, but it cannot express it through a causative construction, because the Cause schema is not a source of possessive expressions: *'I cause something to be/ to happen' → 'I own something'. It follows, that the possible syntactic and lexical sources of possessive constructions in a given language are, to a certain extent, predictable. This is valid for Belarusian and Lithuanian as well: they are expected to have derived their possessive constructions from one of the above mentioned source schemas. The present analysis aims exactly at determining which one(s) of the source schemas Belarusian and Lithuanian have chosen as source of their possessive expressions.

The typological research has also determined, that a language may use more than one schema to derive its possessive constructions. In this case, usually, different schemas are used to express different possessive notions – that is, they are used to express different possessive relations.

This is the case, for instance, in Russian, where the major possessive strategy is derived from the Location schema (*u menja est' 'at me is'* = 'I have'), but where the verb *imet'* 'have' is found too. Yet, *imet'* is used almost exclusively to express abstract and inanimate relations, and it is not used in the case of ownership relations: ***imeju želanie** idti v kino* 'I have the desire of going to the cinema' but ****imeju kvartiru** v Moskve* 'I have an apartment in Moscow' (about Russian 'have' cf. Mikaelian 2002, Guiraud-Weber, Mikaeljan 2004). In the present analysis, the possessive constructions Belarusian and Lithuanian dispose of will be analysed, in order to find out, which specific meanings they can, or cannot, express.

(ii) An outline of the work

This work is divided into two parts. The first is conceived as an introduction to the notion of "Possession". Surprisingly as it may seem, it is not easy to state a clear definition of this elusive concept, which is, though, quite a basic phenomenon in human experience. The attempt to define

Possession may prove to be extremely frustrating - an inference I have made based on personal experience. In fact, it is not so simple to find a clear-cut criterion that might account for all the different relations, commonly referred to as "possessive". If there is no doubt that an expression like *I have a cat* is surely an instance of Possession, what about expressions like *I have two sisters, I had an interesting conversation with Barack Obama* or *Harry has a magic wand in his hand*?

In the first chapter it will be tried to answer to this and to other questions, that may arise with reference to the conceptual nature of Possession, and some of the numerous theories that have been formulated to fulfil the difficult task of defining this notion will be presented.

The second chapter is dedicated to the linguistic expression of Possession. First of all, a distinction will be drawn between the two main realizations of the possessive relation in the languages of the world: adnominal and predicative Possession. Then, the aforementioned 'source schemas' will be presented more in detail.

The second part may be considered the nucleus of the work. Chapter three aims at contextualizing Belarusian and Lithuanian from the point of view of their history, their genetic affiliation and their areal context. As said above, the areal context (as well as the genetic affiliation) is of particular importance to understand some of the processes that have taken place in our two languages. Therefore, in this chapter a brief survey will be made, concerning the strategies for the expression of Possession in the languages that are related to Belarusian and Lithuanian, either genetically or geographically. Then, the linguistic history of Belarus' and Lithuania will be described. Particular attention will be dedicated to the formation of the literary standards of both languages, and to the present sociolinguistic situation in Belarus'.

In chapter four the corpora from which the analysed data come from will be presented. In chapter five the results of the analysis of the data will be exposed: the different constructions Belarusian and Lithuanian use to express Possession will be presented, as well as the semantic functions each one of them may express.

Chapter six is explicitly dedicated to a more detailed analysis of the functions that the 'have'-verbs Lithuanian and Belarusian dispose of (*mec'* and *turėti*) can fulfil in these languages.

Finally, the conclusions of the analysis of the data will be drawn.

I Part

Possession: An introduction

Chapter 1. An introduction to Possession

Possession has been recognized by most scholars as a linguistic universal: that means that every human language is expected to have some morphosyntactic strategies for its expression (Heine 1997, Stassen 2009). However, despite its universality and its central role in everyday life, it is very difficult to define clearly the notion of "Possession": Clancy (2010:121) speaks of it as a "thorny problem".

Perhaps, the most neutral way to define Possession is to term it as an asymmetrical relationship between two entities, called Possessor and Possessee (Seiler 1983, Langacker 2009, Stassen 2009). Several theories have been proposed to explain the exact content of this relationship.

Possession has been claimed to be a sub-domain of Location, the discriminating criterion between the two being animacy (Lyons 1968, Clark 1978). Seiler (1983) considers Possession as a "bio-cultural" concept: "Semantically, the domain of POSSESSION can be described as bio-cultural. It is the relationship between a human being, his kinsmen, his body parts, his material belongings, his cultural and intellectual products. In a more extended view, it is the relationship between parts and whole of an organism" (*ibid*.:4; capital letters by the author).

Langacker (1999, 2000, 2009 *et al.*) proposes a definition based on the cognitive reference-point ability, while Taylor (1996) defines Possession in terms of an experiential *gestalt*.

1.1 The Location Hypothesis

The "Location Hypothesis", as this approach is defined by Stassen (2009:12), can be synthetically defined through the label "Possession is Location", as it is based on the claim that Possession should be considered as a sub-domain of Location (*inter alia,* Lyons 1967, 1977; Clark 1978). Lyon's and Clark's approach has also been defined 'reductionist' (Stassen 2009:13), as it "reduces" Possession to a form of Location.

The main argument Lyons and Clark produce in support of their theory is in the form of linguistic evidence: in many unrelated languages, possessive constructions formally coincide with locative ones, or are derived from originally locative constructions. Consequently, Lyons concludes that "it can be argued that so-called possessive expressions are to be regarded as a subclass of locatives (as they very obviously are, in terms of their grammatical structure, in certain languages)" (Lyons 1977:474). Both Lyons and Clark assume the discriminating criterion between Location and Possession to be animacy:

> 'I argue that the possessor in […] possessive constructions is simply an animate place. The object possessed is located in space, just as the object designed in existential or locative sentences. In possessive constructions, the place happens to be an animate being, such that a + Animate Loc becomes a Pr [Possessor]'
> (Clark 1978: 89)

By all means, the conceptual connection between Possession and Location cannot be denied: these notions are tightly connected, as it is proved by their often identical formal encoding in languages. Nevertheless, the "strict" reductionist claim that "Possession is Location" has been an object of several criticisms (*inter alia*, Payne 2009, Tham (ms.), Stassen 2009):

> 'I do not dismiss the clear linguistic evidence that human beings can and even often do see conceptual connections between predicating location of an object, possession of an object and existence of an object […]. I do, however, believe it is too reductionist to say that they are simply the same.'
> (Payne 2009:116)

From the conceptual point of view, the complete identification of Possession with Location cannot be held: human beings clearly distinguish between the two notions (and that is primarily the reason why languages have developed distinct strategies for the expression of Possession, Payne 2009:116)[2]. From the point of view of the linguistic encoding of Possession, the hypothesis "Possession is (only) animate Location" cannot be completely accepted either. In fact, as broadly demonstrated in Heine (1997) and Stassen (2009), possessive constructions do not derive from locative ones in all languages: they may also be derived from comitative, agentive and topical constructions[3].

Moreover, as Tham (ms.) points out, even in the languages where possessive and locative constructions formally coincide, not all animate places are interpreted as Possessors by the speakers. Generally, a language associates only one spatial relation with the expression of Possession. Every other locative relation, even if associated with an animate participant, will not be interpreted as possessive:

---

[2] It must be underlined, however, that neither Lyons (1967, 1978) nor Clark (1978) have ever claimed that the two notions are conceptually identical. Rather, they claim that Possession is represented in language as a form of abstract location (Lyons 1977:722): but this does not mean, that the two notions are the same.

[3] Clark herself recognizes a certain variety of encoding of Possession in the languages she used as samples (Clark 1978:114ff.). However, she does not consider the dative, genitive or comitative encoding of the Possessor as contradictory to her theory, as she understands datives, genitives and comitatives as being locative in nature. Lyons (1968:397) defines the role of dative Possessors (as in the Latin construction *mihi est*, to.me is, 'I have') as a benefactive and not as a location. Yet he defends a localist view, according to which the benefactive meaning of datives may also be traced back to an original locative meaning ('to go towards something' → 'to be for something'). As far as English *have* is concerned, Lyons (1968:392-393) considers it as a mere surface phenomenon, whose deep structure is to be found in the correspondent genitive converse, that has a locative basis as well*:* a. *the book is Tom's* → b. *Tom has a book*. According to Lyons, a. was transformed into b. in order to put 'Tom' in the subject position (as animate nouns tend to be given this syntactical role with active verbs) and to account for the indefiniteness of the Possessee (since **a book is Tom's* would be ungrammatical).Thus, according to this view, the basically locative template of possessives is preserved, even though surface constructions may have actually been derived from other conceptual domains.

'even in languages where PSRs [Possessors] are encoded by a locative case and the PSR [Possessor] interpretation is the only one possible for an animate-denoting nominal marked by this case, true animate locations are always available for expressing such spatial relations as BEHIND, BESIDE etc.'
(Tham, ms:12)

It follows, that a Possessor must be, conceptually, "something more" than a simple 'animate (or even human) Location': otherwise, logically, *any* human Location could be interpreted as a Possessor. Besides, it is also possible (at least in some languages) that a locative construction, grammaticalized into a possessive one, still retains its original spatial meaning: that is, it may be associated with a human Location, without thereby meaning Possession. This is exactly the case in Russian: the expression *u menja mašina* [lit.'at me car'] means 'I have a car', but, put in a different word order, *mašina u menja* [lit.'car at me'], means 'the car is at my place (in my garage)'. The adessive construction *u* 'at' + Gen. has been grammaticalized in Russian into a possessive construction, but it can still express Location. If human Location were a sufficient criterion to determine a possessive interpretation, such cases would not be allowed, as they would involve too great an ambiguity.

Seliverstova (2004 [1975, 1990]) presents the question of the interdependence of Location and Possession in semantic terms, proposing to interpret it metaphorically. She defines the semantic content of possessive relations in terms of "localization of the Possessee in the Possessor's 'existence'". Seliverstova understands the term 'existence' as all the entities a human being can be said to be in relation with, including his/her material possessions, his/her moral and physical characteristics, his/her actions, his/her social relations, and so forth (Seliverstova 2004 [1975]:142-3). The localization process of the Possessee in the Possessor's existence is defined as the Possessor's "spread" over the Possessee. This spread may be realized in three ways:

'a) X spreads its "force field" over Y, that is, Y finds itself under X's control (physical, juridical, moral);
b) X is spread over Y physically or functionally, that is, Y is a part of X or a part of X's existence (vital activity, functioning);
c) Y brings in itself an element of the possessor (it has a property, which is a relationship to the possessor- *his friend*, *his enemy*)'
(Seliverstova 2004 [1990]:578-579; my translation; italics by the author)

According to Seliverstova, thus, "X has Y" can be understood either as 'Y is under X's physical or legal control (Y is in X's hands; X owns Y)', or as 'Y is a part of X's body', or, finally, as 'Y is socially (or biologically) related to X (Y is X's brother, friend, neighbour)'. In the case of Y being under X's physical control, X and Y are physically located close to each other. In all other cases, on the contrary, the locational element must be understood as metaphorical. Possessors are, therefore,

understood as Locations only insofar they may be metaphorically represented as the place where the Possessee is found[4].

1.2 "Reference-point relationship" and "experiential gestalt": cognitive approaches to Possession

Langacker (1999, 2000, 2009 *et al.*) defines possessive expressions as belonging to the class of the so-called "reference-point relationships". These are relations, where one of the two terms is chosen to be the reference point from whose perspective the situation is considered. The ability to establish reference points is a basic human cognitive capacity that Langacker defines as follows:

> '[the] capacity for invoking one conceived entity as a reference point in order to establish mental contact with another, i.e. to mentally access one conceived entity through another. The entity accessed in this way is called the target in the reference point relationship. The set of entities accessible through a given reference point (the set of potential targets) are collectively referred to as its dominion.'
> (Langacker 2009:46)

In the case of possessive relations, the reference point is the Possessor, the target is the Possessee and the dominion is identified with the Possessor's 'experience' (which can be understood as Seliverstova's 'existence').

The definition of possessive relations on the basis of the reference-point ability indeed presents many advantages: as Langacker (2009) points out, this model is "sufficiently abstract and flexible to accommodate the full range of possessive expressions. At the same time, it is inherently asymmetrical, thus accounting for the typical irreversibility of possessive relationships" (*ibid.*: 82).

Taylor (1996) proposes instead an interpretation of Possession based on the concept of "experiential *gestalt*". This is "a cluster of aspects, grounded in experience, which together define paradigmatic, or prototypical [Possession]" (Taylor 1996:340). In Taylor's approach, Possession is not considered as a "clear-cut" definable notion. Rather, it results from the co-occurrence of typical features, which, together, form the *gestalt*.

According to him, the following aspects may be distinguished in the Possession *gestalt*:

1. 'The possessor is a specific human being
2. The possessed is an inanimate entity, usually a concrete physical object
3. The relation is exclusive, in the sense that for any possessed entity there is usually only one possessor. On the other hand, for any possessor, there is typically a large number of entities which may count as his possessions
4. The possessor has exclusive rights of access to the possessed. Other persons may have access to the possessed only with the permission of the possessor.
5. The possessed is typically an object of value, whether commercial or sentimental

---

[4] Langacker (2009 *et al.*) expresses the same concept in cognitive terms (see below).

6. The possessor's rights of access to the possessed are invested in him through a special transaction, such as purchase, inheritance, or gift, and remain with him until the possessor effects their transfer to another person by means of a further transaction, such as sale or donation
7. Typically, the possession relation is long term, measured in months and years, not in minutes or seconds
8. In order that the possessor can have easy access to the possessed, the possessed is typically located in the proximity of the possessor. In some cases, the possessed may be a permanent, or at last a regular, accompaniment of the possessor.'

(Taylor 1996:340)

Here, Taylor introduces the concept of 'prototypicality': he considers Possession as a semantic category that can be effectively described through a prototype-approach. That is, there may be different relations that can be defined possessive, but they are not equally representative of the category in its whole. In Taylor's view, prototypical Possession is defined through the paradigmatic properties quoted above. An expression where all the properties are fulfilled is a prototypical instance of Possession, whereas an expression where only some of them are present is non-prototypical. So, for instance, a sentence like *John has a new car* fulfils all the paradigmatic properties: the Possessor is a human being (1.), the Possessee is an inanimate object of a certain value (2., 3., 5.), the Possessor has the exclusive right of selling or lending the Possessee (4., 6), which is usually at his disposal and, therefore, it is located next to him (8.).

A prototype-approach has been adopted by other scholars too: *inter alia*, Heine 1997, Langacker 2000 et al., Stassen 2009. The decision of considering Possession as a prototypically organized category indeed presents many advantages. Such a model accounts for the extreme variety of possessive relations that cannot be reduced to a single, clear-cut notion.

1.3 Possessive notions and the prototype approach

As just mentioned, many scholars have chosen a prototype-approach when dealing with Possession. Typically, the prototypical possessive relation has been considered to be ownership (*inter alia* Heine 1997, Baron and Herslund 2001a, Stassen 2009). It represents, in fact, even intuitively, the most representative element of the category of Possession: an expression like *Mary has a house* "sounds" instinctively "more possessive" than *Mary has a good memory*.

Heine "sums up" the paradigmatic properties proposed by Taylor in a list of five properties, that sketch the profile of a prototypical instance of Possession. This profile corresponds perfectly to the notion of ownership:

1) The possessor is a human being;
2) The possessee is a concrete item;
3) The possessor has the right to make use of the possessee;
4) Possessor and Possessee are in spatial proximity;

5) Possession has no conceivable temporal limit.
(Heine 1997:39)

A further proof of the central role ownership occupies within the domain of Possession is provided by Baron and Herslund (2001a:11). They point out, that this notion is given - at least in many languages - some specific lexical means of expressions, that cannot be used to express non-ownership possessive relations. The English verbs *belong*, *possess* and *own* are examples of that: *I possess, own a house* but **I possess a cold*, **I own blue eyes*.

A different model is proposed by Langacker (2000, 2002, 2009 *et al.*). He does not consider ownership as the only prototypical notion, but prefers instead a representation of Possession as a polycentric domain, within which three prototypical concepts can be individuated: ownership itself, part-whole relations and kinship relations:

> '[…] instead of assuming that any one concept (like ownership) necessarily constitutes a unique, clear-cut prototype and basis for metaphorical extension, I propose that the category clusters around several conceptual archetypes, which of each saliently which saliently incorporates a reference point relationship: these archetypes include ownership, kinship, and part/whole relations involving physical objects (the body in particular).'
> (Langacker 2000:176)

> 'the reason that ownership, part/whole, and kinship relations are prototypical for possessives is that they in particular are central to our experience and lend themselves very well to this reference-point function. In the nature of human experience, people are far more likely to be known individually than their possessions and are thus more readily construed as reference points than as targets in the conception of their relationship (*The beggar has a cup*; ??*The cup has a beggar*). Similarly, a part is characterized in relation to a larger whole, which usually has greater cognitive salience and is quite naturally chosen as a reference point (*The woman has long legs*; ??*The long legs have a woman*). And for kinship terms, the possessor (ego) is a reference point virtually by definition.'
> (Langacker 2002:338; italics by the author)

While writing this work, I have changed my mind countless times about which one of these two models is to be preferred: the 'ownership-only' or the 'ownership, part-whole and kinship relations' one. Finally, I have decided to follow the first model. I consider Possession as a 'family resemblance' category (as Taylor 1996 defines it), with its prototype coinciding with the notion of ownership. Of course, I do not dismiss the fact that part-whole (including body-parts) and kinship relations are central to the category of Possession, in particular to the category of Inalienable Possession. However, the 'ownership-only' model is, in my opinion, the one that offers a better explanation to why an expression like *I have a house* "sounds" instinctively "more possessive" than expressions like *I have a sister* or *hands have fingers*.

Another solution could also be found. Part-whole and kinship relationships – the archetypes that Langacker proposes for the category of Possession- are, typically, inalienable. It could be, thus, proposed to consider them as prototypical indeed, but to a different category, Inalienable

Possession, distinct from Alienable Possession, whose prototype would remain ownership. In this case, any attempt to unify them – that is, to find a common prototype – would be conceptually misleading.

The hypothesis of considering Alienable and Inalienable possession as two distinct conceptual domains is fascinating. The fact that, in some languages, the same linguistic tools are used for the expression of the one and the other category (as the verb *have* in English, for instance) could be explained as an analogy phenomenon: both categories belong to the class of the 'reference-point relationships', and, therefore, they may end in being expressed through the same linguistic means. However, in the languages I had to deal with (Belarusian and Lithuanian firstly, and then English), I have not observed a essential difference in the linguistic encoding of part-whole, kinship and body-part relations on the one hand and alienable entities or alienable social relations - relationships of friendship, neighbourhood, etc. - on the other. Therefore, for a matter of simplicity, I have not looked deeper into the hypothesis of Inalienable Possession being a separate domain from Alienable Possession. I have simply considered Inalienable Possession as a sub-domain of Possession, and ownership as the most prototypical relation for the whole category (following the model presented in Heine 1997:40).

1.4 The semantic space of Possession: the "possessive notions"

In the foregoing the contraposition between prototypical and non-prototypical possessive relations has been mentioned. Having assumed that ownership may be considered as the most prototypical relation for the whole category of Possession, the classification of the other possessive relations, though, is not that simple a task: perhaps, this is even the most complicated issue one is confronted with when dealing with Possession. The variety of relations that can be subsumed under this heading, is extraordinary: *Mary has two sons*; *John has a cat*; *she has a new car*; *I have Tom's chemistry book.*

In order to "sort out" the different relations that may be labelled as possessive, Miller and Johnson-Laird (1976:562ff.) have distinguished four basic forms that the notion of Possession may take: 'inherent Possession', 'accidental Possession', 'physical Possession' and 'inalienable Possession'. 'Inherent Possession', or ownership, or property, involves a legal right on the Possessee: The Possessor is the legal owner of the Possessee, and enjoys all the prerogative thus given to him/her (s/he holds the right to sell, lend or destroy the Possessee). 'Accidental Possession' arises when the Possessor is in possession of an object that is not his/her property. It corresponds to the legal notion of *possession*, contraposed to *ownership*: *John has Tom's computer* ('Tom's computer is in John's possession, but John cannot claim legal rights to it'). The notion of 'physical Possession' describes

the cases where the Possessor has the Possessee physically near/with/on him/her: *John has money with him.* Physical possession may be related to accidental possession, but the two concepts must be kept separate: a person may be in possession of an object owned by someone else (accidental possession), but s/he may not have it with him/her at the reference time. Miller and Johnson-Laird (1976:565) represent these three types of Possession with a clear example: "She owns an umbrella [inherent Possession] but she's borrowed it [accidental Possession], though she doesn't have it with her [physical Possession]". Finally the notion of 'inalienable Possession' includes all relations where the Possessee is part of the Possessor, or a relative of his/hers: *John has a son, John has blond hair, the house has four rooms*.

Heine (1997) further specifies the distinctions that Miller and Johnson-Laird have proposed. He distinguishes eight basic types of possessive relations, which he labels as 'possessive notions':

> **PHYSICAL POSSESSION:** The PR [Possessor] and the PE [Possessee] are physically associated with another at the reference time: *I want to fill in this form; do you have a pen?*;
>
> **TEMPORARY POSSESSION**: The PR can dispose of the PE for a limited time but s/he cannot claim ownership to it: *I have a car that I use to go to the office but it belongs to Judy*;
>
> **ALIENABLE PERMANENT POSSESSION:** The PE is the property of the PR, and typically the PR has a legal title to the PE: *Judy has a car and I use it all the time*;
>
> **INALIENABLE POSSESSION**: The PE is typically conceived of as being inseparable from the PR, e.g., as a body-part or as a relative: *I have blue eyes/two sisters*;
>
> **ABSTRACT POSSESSION**: The PE is a concept that is not visible or tangible, like a disease, a feeling, or some other psychological state: *He has no time/no mercy*;
>
> **INANIMATE INALIENABLE POSSESSION**: This notion, which is frequently referred to as part-whole relationship, differs from Inalienable in that the PR is inanimate, and the PE and the PR are conceived of as being inseparable: *That tree has few branches*;
>
> **INANIMATE ALIENABLE POSSESSION**: The PR is inanimate and the PE is separable from the PR: *That tree has crows on it*.
> (Heine 1997:34-5)

These notions are distinguished on the basis of the paradigmatic properties mentioned by Taylor (see above). For instance, Temporary Possession does not fulfil the property of the relation having an unlimited time length; Abstract Possession does not fulfil the property of the Possessee being a concrete item, and so forth. The level to which the notions correspond to the paradigmatic properties also helps in defining the degree of prototypicality of each possessive notion: "in terms of relative number of properties, one may say that permanent possession is most central to the prototype, that is, it exhibits a maximal degree of prototypicality, physical, temporary, and inalienable possession a reduced degree, and abstract and inanimate possession a minimal degree of prototypicality" (Heine 1997:40).

Stassen (2009) defines the possessive notions as "sub-domains" of the conceptual space of Possession. He accepts in his list only four of the eight notions proposed by Heine: Alienable Permanent Possession, Temporary Possession (conceived as grouping together Heine's Physical and temporary Possession), Inalienable Possession and Abstract Possession; while he considers Inanimate Possession as a mere metaphorical extension of Alienable Possession (*ibid*.:16ff.).

1.5 Defining the semantics of Possession: three parameters

As seen above, the paradigmatic properties proposed by Taylor (1996) and by Heine (1997) are central for the definition of the prototype and for the distinction of the possessive notions. It is possible to reduce the paradigmatic properties to only three parameters, that result in being the "basic ingredients" of any instance of Possession: 'time' (the length of the relationship), 'location' (spatial proximity between Possessor and Possessee) and 'control' (the permissibility/possibility for the PR to use the PE).

If we look at the list of prototypical properties as presented in Heine (1997:39; see above, 1.3) we can see that the third, fourth and fifth properties refer directly to the parameters quoted above. As far as the first and second property – i.e. those regarding the humanness of the Possessor and the non-humanness of the Possessee – are concerned, they are strictly linked to the parameter of control: only humans can execute control (Stassen 2009:15).

The central role that the notion of location plays in the semantics of Possession has already been discussed when presenting the "Location hypothesis". I would add that, when speaking of Location as a parameter for the definition of Possession, it is necessary to distinguish between 'abstract location' and 'concrete (or physical) location'. 'Abstract Location' might be said to correspond to what Seliverstova (2004 [1975]:142-3) describes as "the Possessee being located in the Possessor's existence". Evidently, this "localization" is not to be understood as the Possessee being concretely located in the proximity of its Possessor. Rather, it means that the Possessee is somehow "related" to its Possessor, and it is therefore a pure metaphorical notion. On the contrary, 'concrete Location' is found in expressions where a real, physical spatial relation between the two entities is predicated, as in the case of Physical Possession: *I have money with me now.*

It is evident, thus, that Location alone cannot determine Possession. 'Abstract Location' ('Possessee is located in the Possessor's existence, and it is therefore related to him/her') is far too general a notion, and it does not explain the exact nature of this relationship. 'Concrete Location' is also not sufficient to determine a possessive relation: *John is under the table* is a perfect case of concrete Location, but it is clearly not an instance of Possession.

Miller and Johnson-Laird try to solve the problem of distinguishing between Location and Possession by invoking the notion of "possibility of use": "[accidental possession] goes beyond a locative or physical relation. If a person has accidental possession of an object, it is possible for him to use it and it may not be possible for anyone else to use it" (Miller and Johnson-Laird 1976:564). This "possibility, or right, of using the Possessee" is what Stassen refers to as 'control'. In his view, a Possessor exerts control over his/her Possessee to the extent that s/he has the right to decide the whereabouts of the latter, and the right to manipulate it, sell it, buy it or lend it. In other words, Stassen understands 'control' as "power": "the Possessor has the right and the power of manipulating the Possessee":

> 'the role of control in possessive constructions has been formulated concisely by Evans (1995: 146) […]: 'X [the possessor] can expect Y [the possessee] to be in the same place as X when X wants, and X can do with Y what X wants.' Thus, basically, the notion of 'control' can be described in terms of 'power'. […](I)n the case of possession the possessor can be seen as exerting control over the possessee: after all, it is the possessor that determines the whereabouts of the possessee and generally determines what happens to it, and it is the possessor who is the decisive factor in continuing or terminating the possessive relation with the possessee. It should be pointed out that, if we accept control as a parameter in the semantics of possession, we no longer have to view the human or humanized status of the possessor as a defining factor in the possessive relation. Instead, the [+Human] status of the possessor can now be seen as a consequence of the fact that, in possessive relations, one of the participants has control over the other, and that, in general, it is only humans that can execute control.'
> (Stassen 2009:14-15)

Other authors, though not expressly mentioning the notion of 'control', have expressed quite similar descriptions of this "power". Seliverstova (2004 [1990]:579) describes the Possessee as being subjected to the "physical, juridical, or moral power of the Possessor". Taylor (1996) speaks about the Possessor's "exclusive rights of access" to the Possessee, that can be understood not only as legal ownership ("property right"), but also as the possibility to physically manage the object: "He has a gun […] means that the person has easy access to a gun (possibly, he is already holding it, ready to shoot)" (Taylor 1996:341).

However, the definition of control as "right" or "possibility" of using the Possessee is optimal if applied to ownership and Temporary Possession, but it becomes problematic if related to possessive notions other than these two. For instance, in an inalienable relationship like *John has blond hair* the relation between 'John' and 'his hair' cannot be described in terms of "power" or "use". John does not have the possibility to change the colour of his hair (unless he dyes it, but his natural colour would still be blond). He can manipulate it, but not to a full extent (he can cut it, but he cannot prevent it from growing again, for instance). Therefore, the control *John* may exert over *his hair* is limited and it cannot surely be described in terms of "making use".

Stassen, consequently, supposes that in instances of Inalienable and Abstract Possession control is missing. However, this hypothesis leaves us with the problem of finding another criterion which may be invoked to support the claim that relations of Abstract and Inalienable Possession are actually possessive.

In order to solve this difficulty, Langacker (2009) proposes to understand control as a "privileged relation":

> 'in prototypical instances of possession the possessor (R) actively controls the possessed (T) in some manner – physically, socially, or experientially. The flip side of R controlling T is that R has an exclusive privilege of access to T. In the case of ownership (e.g. my pen), R manipulates T, determines where T is kept, and can use T whenever desired. This control also has social and experiential components. Others acknowledge these privileges. Moreover, R knows where T is and determines whether others can use it. Similarly, a kinship relation entails an array of culturally expected modes of social interaction, one interacts with parents, a child, or a grandchild in a way that others are not allowed or expected to. This privileged social access is basically exclusive: there are few if any other people for whom *my sister* is a sister. Likewise, a part usually belongs to just one highest-level whole. I am the only who can use *my stomach* for digestion.'
> (Langacker 2009: 83-4; italics by the author)

Personally, I find Langacker's definition quite convincing. This "privileged relation", in fact, is an extremely flexible concept, that may apply to ownership (in this case, it will be understood as "permissibility of use; exclusive right of access"), as well as to Temporary Possession (the 'possibility of use') and to Abstract and Inalienable Possession, as Langacker shows above. However, if we accept the 'ownership-only' model, according to which ownership is the only prototypical notion, we must assume that control intended as "power, possibility of making use of or manipulating the Possessee" has a special prototypical value.

We can conclude, thus, that the necessary ingredients of any possessive relation are 'abstract Location' - understood as the Possessee being located in the Possessor's "existence" - and control - understood as the Possessor's privileged right of access (legal, social or experiential) to the Possessee. In particular, the control a human Possessor may exert over his/her legally possessed and inanimate Possessee – a type of control we could paraphrase as "(legal) right of making use of the Possessee" – is more prototypical than other types of abstract control. A form of concrete, or physical, control may be distinguished, too: it could be identified with the control exerted by a person over something s/he holds in his/her hand. The notion of physical control is present in instances of Physical Possession (Heine 1997:34), and it may occasionally be observed in instances of Temporary Possession and ownership too. However, in my opinion, physical control is not a strong enough condition to imply Possession *per se*. Therefore, I consider instances of Physical Possession as instances of Location, rather than instances of Possession.

Finally, the parameter of 'time' plays a crucial role in the distinction of the different possessive notions: they can be ordered on an ideal scale, starting from Temporary Possession (the lowest degree of time stability) to Inalienable Possession (the highest degree of time stability). However, I do not consider time as a necessary ingredient of Possession, at least not to the same extent location and control are. In fact, ownership shows a reduced degree of temporal stability if confronted to Inalienable Possession, and, nevertheless, ownership is prototypical, while Inalienable Possession is not (at least according to the 'ownership-only' model). This is due to the fact that it is control, and not time, the parameter, that determines prototypicality: in instances of Inalienable Possession, control is understood as a "privileged relation", and not as the possibility of "using" or "manipulating" the object. Therefore, ownership is prototypical because it shows the highest degree of prototypical control ("legal power", so to say), even if it has a lesser degree of time stability, in comparison with Inalienable Possession.

1.6 Possessive notions: further remarks

In this work, I will use the possessive notions identified in Heine (1997) to describe the meanings expressed by the possessive constructions in Belarusian and Lithuanian. As it will be thoroughly shown in the following chapters, some constructions can be used only to express some possessive notions, whereas others have a much wider range of uses.

I believe, though, that Heine's classification should be slightly modified: the classification of the possessive notions I propose differs from Heine's one in some points.

1.6.1 Physical Possession and Inanimate Alienable Possession

The distinction between the notions of Location and of Physical Possession was one of the thorniest pieces in the whole puzzle of Possession, for me. I have changed my mind several times about the semantic domain instances of Physical Possession should be related to: are they instances of Possession, or rather of Location?

The problem with the languages that I examined is that expressions of Physical Possession have a clear locative meaning, and also a clear formal possessive encoding: in English, for instance, they are expressed through the verb *have*, as in *I have a book in my hand*. Heine (1997) considers the presence of the latter property sufficient to classify an expression as possessive:

> 'one might argue that examples such as [*that three has few branches; my study has three windows*] and [*that tree has crows on it; my study has a lot of useless books in it*] are not suggestive of possession, rather that they can be analyzed more profitably with reference to other conceptual domains [...].

> The main reason for treating them all as possessive notions is that in many languages they are expressed in the same way as prototypical instances of possession.'
> (Heine 1997:36)

However, I do not completely agree with him on this point. Heine is surely right when he underlines the fact that the use of a possessive construction (identified as such because it can express ownership) just cannot be ignored: the use of a possessive construction evidently signals that there is a hint of Possession in there[5]. However, possessive constructions may be used to express non-possessive meanings too, as in the well-known English construction *have to,* which is related to Possession indeed, but only diachronically ("I have something to read"→ "I have to read something") and not synchronically. Therefore, we must take into consideration the possibility that a formal possessive encoding may actually express a notion that is not Possession. In the case of modality, this is quite clear, as Possession and modality are two quite different notions. Yet, in the case of Location, which is so central a concept for the semantics of Possession itself, the difference between the two notions is much more complicated. The parameters mentioned above, and the parameter of 'control' in particular, help to clarify this point.

In the case of the distinction between "Physical Possession" and "Location", most authors consider physical control (basically, the act of holding something in the hand, or having something on oneself) as a sufficient condition for a possessive interpretation to arise (Miller and Johnson-Laird 1977, Heine 1997, Seliverstova 2004 [1990]). So, a sentence like a. (given below) is considered as an instance of Possession, namely Physical Possession:

a. *I have a book in my hand*
   (Heine 1997:191)

However, I do not see here that possibility of manipulating the Possessee ('abstract control'), that is characteristic to Possession. The mere act of 'holding', in fact, does not imply that I can really *use* the object I hold: an expression like the one presented in sentence a. states that there is indeed a certain relation between the subject and the object – but this relation is merely locative.

Therefore I suggest considering expressions like *John has a book in his hand* as instances of Location, even if they are encoded with a possessive construction. We could imagine Physical Possession as being the result of the domain of Location superposing the domain of Possession,as already proposed by Činčlej:

> 'the meaning of temporary Possession[6] is intermediate, transitory between the meanings of permanent Possession and Location. It has much in common with each of these two concepts,

---

[5] The use of possessive constructions to express concepts such as modality (*to have to*) is related to Possession at least in a diachronic way.
[6] Činčlej does not distinguish Physical and Temporary Possession.

but, at the same time, it cannot be identified with any of them. The difference between temporary and permanent Possession is the most evident, both from a semantic as of a formal point of view [...]. The difference between the meanings of temporary Possession and Location is less evident. This is why they often formally coincide.'
(Činčlej 1990:55; my translation)

Expressions of Physical Possession already occupy a very peripheral area of the domain of Possession, as they presuppose a primitive form of control ('concrete', or 'physical'), which is the reason why they are encoded through possessive constructions, as Činčlej points out. In this work I will list Physical Possession among the possessive notions: however, it should be clear, that instances of Physical Possession are essentially locative expressions with an embryonic possessive nuance[7].

Similarly, I consider what Heine (1997:34-5) labels as Inanimate Alienable Possession to be instances of Location as well. In fact, the only possessive element in a sentence like *the table has books on it* is the possessive predicate *have*. However, I do not consider this as a sufficient criterion for a possessive interpretation: even if the formal encoding is possessive, the semantic content of the relation is clearly purely locative[8].

1.6.2 Temporary Possession

As far as Temporary Possession is concerned, it is quite difficult to identify its instances, unless a language disposes of a special encoding for this notion. In languages such as English, which can use the same linguistic means to express both Temporary and Permanent Possession (ownership), the correct interpretation can often be deduced only from the context.

In general, there are be two types of situations where an interpretation of Temporary Possession is likely to arise:

1. The temporary nature of the possessive relation is determined by the semantics of the PE itself:

> *He has a **vanilla ice-cream***

A 'vanilla ice-cream' is a clearly ephemeral Possessee. It lasts only for the time necessary to be eaten by its lucky Possessor, and it cannot be the object of a long-lasting, ownership-like relation.

---

[7] As it will be shown in the next chapter, expressions of Physical Possession are quite important in the process of grammaticalization of possessive constructions (particularly, of the verb 'have').
[8] It must also be said that, even if sentences in English like *the table has books on it* are grammatically correct, in other languages they are not, and they would be expressed through locative constructions.
Italian
?Il tavolo ha dei libri sopra 'the table has books on it' [lit. 'the table has some books over']
Sul tavolo ci sono dei libri 'there are some books on the table' [lit. 'on the table there are some books']

2. The temporary nature of the possessive relation is determined by the context (thus, on the textual level)**:**

> *I have a car that I use to go to the office **but it belongs to Judy*** (Heine 1997:34)

In this case, the fact that the possessive relation is temporary can be inferred only if the whole text is taken into consideration. If part of the text is removed, then the meaning of Temporary Possession fades away, or it becomes more difficult to infer it:

> *I have a car that I use to go to the office* (my own car *or* someone else's car)

A particular class of expressions has caused me many difficulties. These are expressions where a possessive construction is used with a comitative or a local adjunct that establishes the location of the Possessee to be the Possessor him/herself:

> *Do you have your passport **with you**?*
> *He has money **on him***

In this case, the problem is to determine whether the Possessor does or does not make use of the Possessee, by exerting control over it. On the one hand, the informative aim of the sentences presented above is not to state the possibility/willingness of the Possessor to use his/her money/passport, but rather to provide information about their location – and, thus, these should be considered as instances of Physical Possession. On the other hand, if one has money or a passport on oneself, one is likely to be allowed - and is also most probably willing - to use them (spending the money and showing the passport to the police when crossing a border, for instance). In any case, I believe that these expressions should be classified as instances of Physical Possession, and not of Temporary Possession.

Finally, when it comes to expressions such as *he has a pink shirt on* (Heine 1997:191)*,* I am very doubtful about their actual belonging to the domain of Possession. Heine considers them as instances of Physical Possession, but I can see neither Possession nor Location here. Admittedly, both a possessive verb (*have*) and a spatial preposition (*on*) are used. Still, I would rather consider this expression simply as an idiomatic expression for 'wearing', which, even if diachronically derived from a possessive and a locative expression, is no more connected to the domains of Possession and Location.

1.6.3 Social Possession

Neither Heine nor Stassen distinguish Social Possession (the notion that covers the cases where the Possessee is a human being) as a possessive notion of its own, and its treatment by both the authors is quite obscure. Heine mentions the label 'social possession' (Heine 1997:9), but he does not include this notion in his classification (*ibid.*: 34-35). He seems rather to subsume it in the category of Inalienable Possession (kinship relations).

Actually, though, Social Possession cannot be completely subsumed under the label of Inalienable Possession. There are, in fact, some social relations that are not inalienable: *my friend*, *my neighbour*. An option would be to consider alienable social relations as instances of Abstract Possession. This choice has valid grounds. First, humans, just like abstract concepts, cannot be 'possessed' (unless in the case of slavery): ** I own, possess a friend; * I own, possess a problem*. Semantically, moreover, a social relation and an abstract relation are equally non-prototypical to the category of Possession. Second, in some languages abstract and human Possessees receive the same treatment. For instance, in Belarusian, the old possessive dative is nowadays limited almost exclusively to the expression of abstract and social relations: *mne dvaccac' hadoŭ* 'I am twenty-years-old' [lit. 'to.me twenty years'], *ën mne brat* 'he is my brother' [lit. 'he to.me brother'], *ën mne sjabar* 'he is my friend' [lit. 'he to.me friend']. The same situation is found in Lithuanian, too. Therefore, the category of social Possession could be split into two and be included in the categories of Abstract Possession (alienable social relations: *my friend*) and Inalienable Possession (inalienable social relations: *my father*). Probably, this is what Heine (1997) and Stassen (2009) have done, even if they are not explicit about this point.

In this work, however, I have decided to consider the feature [+ human] of the Possessee as worth having a category of its own. In fact, it seems logical to me that, if we distinguish a category for non-human Possessors (Inanimate Possession), we should similarly distinguish a category for human Possessees, as in both cases a strong deviance from the ownership-prototype "PR [+ human]; PE [- human]" can be observed. Furthermore, I have decided to distinguish, within the category of Social Possession the notions of Social Inalienable Possession and Social Alienable Possession (see below).

1.6.4 The possessive notions as they are presented in this work

I have presented above some points of disagreement between my classification of the possessive notions and the one presented in Heine (1997). I am aware of the fact that any classification involves the risk of neglecting some aspects. In particular, the classification I have chosen to use can, with all probability, still be improved: other parameters may be chosen, or some parameters

may be given lesser or greater importance. In any case, I consider this classification of the possessive notions adequate to describe the different meanings that possessive constructions can express.

Some of the parameters I have used are relevant only for some possessive notions: for instance, the stability of the possessive relation is relevant only in the case of Temporary and Permanent Possession. What is common to all possessive notions is the parameter 'control', where control is understood in general as "privileged right of access to the PE".

The list of possessive notions I will refer to when analysing the Belarusian and Lithuanian data is the following:

- **Alienable Permanent Possession (ownership)**
  PR [+human]; PE [- human; - abstract; + alienable]; Possessive relation
  [+ permanent]

  The notion of ownership involves a human PR and a concrete, alienable and non-human Possessee. The PR exerts full control on the PE for an unlimited length of time (the PR is the only person entitled to interrupt the relation): *Mary has a new car.*

- **Temporary Possession**
  PR [+ human]; PE [- human; - abstract; + alienable]; Possessive relation
  [- permanent]

  Temporary Possession involves a human PR and a concrete, alienable and non-human Possessee. The PR, contrary to the case of ownership, can dispose of the PE for a given length of time, but their relation is not permanent: *I have a vanilla ice-cream (I am eating it now)*; *I have Tom's car (I use it).*

- **Inalienable Possession**
  PR [+ human]; PE [- human; - abstract; - alienable]

  Inalienable Possession includes the cases of body-part relations, that is, where the PR is human and the PE is a part of the PR himself/herself: *I have blue eyes.*

- **Abstract Possession**

PR [+ human]; PE [- human; + abstract]

Abstract Possession includes the cases where the Possessee is not a concrete item, but it is rather a concept: *I have a problem*, *I have a cold*.

- **Social Possession**
a. **Social Inalienable Possession**
   PR [+ human]; PE [+ human; - alienable]

   Social Inalienable Possession includes kinship relations (also marriage relations): *I have a son*; *she has a good husband.*

b. **Social Alienable Possession**
   PR [+ human]; PE [+ human; + alienable]

   Social Alienable Possession includes all non-kinship social relations: *Mary has good friends.*

- **Inanimate Possession**
a. **Inanimate Inalienable Possession (part-whole relations)**
   PR [- human]; PE [- human; - alienable]

   Inanimate Inalienable Possession incorporates the cases of part-whole relations: *trees have roots*; *the house has three rooms*.

b.**Inanimate Abstract Possession**
   PR [- human; typically: + abstract]; PE [typically: + abstract]

   Inanimate Abstract Possession comprises of all the cases where the Possessor is inanimate, typically abstract, and the Possessee is not a part of it. That is, it covers all those cases of Inanimate Possession that are not classifiable as part-whole relations: *love has many names*; *Italy has a diversified industrial economy.* I have also included in this category those expressions in which the PE is a concrete entity or a human being: *our country does not have the complete set of the journal* Naša Niva; *China has got many talented web-engineers*.

I have not included in my list of possessive notions what Heine (1997:35) labels as "Inanimate Alienable Possession", represented by expressions such as *the table has books on it*. As already said, I consider these expressions to be instances of Location, and not of Possession: and the fact that they must include a locative adjunct (*the table has books **on it***; *my study has many useless books **in it*** (Heine 1997:35)) supports this interpretation.

- **Physical Possession**

  PR [+ human] PE [-human; - abstract; + alienable] [The PR exerts on the PE exclusively physical control]

  As said previously, I consider cases of Physical Possession as being intermediate between the domains of Possession and Location, but being essentially instances of the latter more than of the former (despite their linguistic encoding): *I have money on me.*

Of course, there are expressions that can be effectively analysed with reference to more than one possessive notion. For instance, a sentence like *China has got many talented web-engineers* may be classified both as Inanimate Possession and as Social Possession. In order to solve these cases, I have decided to respect the following hierarchy in criteria:

- PR [+/- human]: the humanness of the Possessor is the most important criterion in my classification, and all those expressions where the Possessor is not a human being are classified as Inanimate Possession (either inalienable or abstract), independently from the characteristics of the Possessee. Therefore, a case like *China has got many talented web-engineers* is classified as Inanimate Possession, and not as Social Possession.
- PE [+/- human]: I have decided to give priority to the (non-)humanness of the Possessee *vis-à-vis* other properties, such as Inalienability. Therefore, a sentence like *I have two daughters*, which can be analysed with reference to both Inalienable and Social Possession, will be classified as Social Inalienable Possession.

The decision of giving priority to the feature [+/- human] of PR and PE *vis-à-vis* the feature [+/- inalienable] is quite arbitrary: I could have also decided to classify the notions of Inanimate Inalienable and Social Inalienable Possession as sub-notions within the category of Inalienable Possession (Inalienable Social Possession, Inalienable Inanimate Possession).

However, it seems to me that the feature [+/- human] of Possessor and Possessee is semantically more salient than their [+/- alienable]: that is, an expression like *I have a friend* may be better analysed with reference to the parameter [+ human] of the Possessee, rather than to its being [+ alienable].

Chapter 2. Encoding Possession in language

In the previous chapter an introduction to the semantic category of possession was provided, and the "possessive notions" were introduced. In the present chapter the ways of encoding Possession in language will be presented.

First, a distinction will be drawn between the two main kinds of linguistic Possession: adnominal and predicative. Then, the possible syntactic encodings of predicative possessive constructions in the languages of the world, as they have been individuated in the typological research, will be presented.

2.1 Attributive and predicative Possession

The first distinction one needs to draw when dealing with the linguistic expression of Possession is between 'adnominal' (or 'attributive', 'phrasal') and 'predicative', or 'sentential', Possession. In the first case the relation between a Possessor and a Possessee is expressed on an NP-internal level, as in *John's car*. In the second case, it is expressed on the sentential, NP-external level and it is mediated by a predicate, as in *John **has** a car* or *The car **is** John's*. This may be called 'predicative internal Possession'. A second kind of sentential Possession is the so-called 'predicative external Possession' (see below, 2.2).

The differences between attributive and predicative Possession goes quite far beyond the mere syntactic level. First of all, in instances of attributive Possession the Possessor and the Possessee hold the same informative role, either topic, as in ***John's car** is new*, or comment, as in *Yesterday I saw **John's new car.*** On the contrary, in predicative expressions the Possessor and the Possessee usually recover two different roles, the first, typically being the topic and the second the comment[9]: ***John** has **a new car***.

Secondly, in expressions of attributive Possession the possessive relation does not constitute the main information of the sentence, but it is rather presupposed (Heine 1997:26): in a sentence like *John's car is new*, the fact that *John* actually possesses *a car* is held as a known fact. In predicative expressions, conversely, the assertion of Possession represents the main informative purpose of the sentence.

---

[9] With the terms 'topic' and 'comment' I refer to the pragmatic roles a constituent plays in the informative structure of a sentence. The 'topic' is the known element, or the element the sentence is informative about: *John's car is new* is informative about the state of *John's car.* The comment represents usually the new information we get about the topic: in a sentence like *John has a Ferrari*, assuming that *John* is the topic, the new information about him is that he possesses a Ferrari (in which case the verb would also be part of the comment) or that, among the many things he may possess, there is a Ferrari.

Finally, instances of attributive Possession are typically much more "vague" and polysemous than those of predicative possession. As Stassen (2009:27) points out, they may be referred to a range of relations that would definitely be unsuitable in instances of predicative Possession. An expression like *John's car is a Ferrari*, for instance, is open to interpretations such as 'the car John dreams of is a Ferrari', 'the car John always speaks about is a Ferrari', 'the car John has projected is a Ferrari', etc, depending upon the knowledge shared between the speaker and the listener. If both of them know that *John* dreams of buying a car, for instance, the sentence above will be easily interpreted as 'the car John always dreams of is a Ferrari'. To the contrary, predicative expressions like *John has a Ferrari* have a more restricted scope of interpretation: the possibility of this sentence being interpreted as 'John has a car he always dreams of and this is a Ferrari' is remote.

2.2 External possession

As mentioned above, usually two types of predicative possessive constructions are distinguished: internal and external. Baron and Herslund (2001a) define external Possession as follows:

> 'such label covers the cases where the Possessor is not expressed in the same noun phrase as the Possessum, viz. as a genitival dependent of the Possessum, as in *She slapped Tom's face*, but is instead realised as an argument of the verb: *She slapped Tom in the face*. What we have is in a sense, something in between predicative and attributive possession: the external possessive construction shares with predicative possession, the feature that the possessive link between Possessor and Possessum is conveyed by a verb; but it shares with attributive possession, the feature that the possessive link is not asserted by a verb, but presupposed. The effect of the external construction is thus a promotion of the Possessor, which instead of being realised as a dependent of the Possessum becomes a primary clause member, cf. the label 'possessor ascension'.
> (Baron and Herslund 2001a:15)

Let us consider the following sentence, an example of external Possession:

Lithuanian

1. *Jis*   *bučiavo*   *jai*   *ranką*
    he.NOM   kiss.PST.3   she.DAT   hand.ACC.SG
    'He kissed her [lit. 'to her'] hand'

In Lithuanian external Possessors receives a dative encoding, as in most European languages: Haspelmath (1999, 2001) has proposed to consider the marking of indirect possessors by a dative adjunct as a characteristic feature of the European linguistic area. In this regard, English is an "odd" language: as the translation of the example above shows, external Possessors are not allowed in

English, in cases like this one[10]. Other European languages deviate from the typical pattern as well. Some of them, like Welsh and Breton, allow no external Possessors at all. Some others – almost all spoken in Northern Europe – encode external Possessor not with a dative but with a locative adjunct: Irish, Icelandic, Norwegian, Swedish, Danish, Estonian, Finnish.

East Slavic languages – including Belarusian- may give external Possessors both a dative (2.) and a locative (3.) encoding[11]:

Belarusian

2. *Toj […]*　　*usmichnuŭšysja,*　　*pacalavaŭ*　　**ëj**　　*ruku*
　　that.M.NOM.SG smile.PGER.REFL　　kiss.PST.SG　　she.DAT　　hand.ACC.SG

　' He [...] kissed her hand with a smile [lit. 'kissed to her the hand']

3. **U Alenki**　　*pachaladzela*　　*spina*
　　At Alenka.GEN　　grow_cold.PST.F.SG　back.NOM.SG

　'Alena's back grew cold [lit. 'at Alenka back grew cold']'

With reference to external Possession, along with the dative marking of the Possessor Haspelmath points out another phenomenon typical to the European languages. In most of them external Possessors are allowed "only if the possessor is thought of as being mentally affected by the described situation" (Haspelmath 1999:111). Because of this "affectedness-condition" the Possessee is most typically represented by body parts, as in the Lithuanian sentence quoted above. What affects a part of the body; in fact, usually have consequences upon the whole person.

Let us consider the following sentences:

Lithuanian

4. *Jis*　　*bučiavo*　　**jai**　　*ranką*
　　He.NOM kiss.PST.3　she.DAT　　hand.ACC.SG

　'He kissed her [lit. 'to her'] the hand'

---

[10] English does not allow external Possessors when the Possessee is the direct object of a transitive verb: *He kiss (to) her the hand*. However, it does allow external Possession in cases where the Possessor is codified as the object, and the Possessee as a prepositional adjunct: *He slapped Tom* (PR) *in the face* (PE). Belarusian and Lithuanian also allow this type of external constructions:
Lithuanian
Šu　　*įkando*　　*mane į koją*
dog.NOM.SG bite.PST.3　　I.ACC on leg.ACC.SG
'The dog bit me on the leg'
Belarusian
Sabaka ŭkusiŭ　　*mjane*　　*za nahu*
dog　bite.PST.M.SG I.ACC　　for leg.ACC.SG
'id.'

[11] In 3, *u Alenki* is not only to be understood as an external Possessor, but as an Experiencer as well. This is a characteristic of East Slavic (Russian, Ukrainian and Belarusian) *u* + Gen.: it may express both Possessor and Experiencer (Weiss 1999:175)

5. *Jis   bučiavo   **jos**   rankǎ*
   he.NOM   kiss.PST.3   she.GEN   hand.ACC.SG
   '   He kissed her hand'

In 4. the action of kissing the woman's hand is presented as affecting her as a whole: The man does not just kiss her hand, but, by doing so, he pays homage to her whole person. On the contrary, in 5., the 'hand' is presented as though it were "detached" from the body, and the 'homage interpretation' is weaker, if not even completely absent.

A further phenomenon, connected to external Possession, is what König and Haspelmath (1997:573) label as 'implicit Possessor'. In some cases, the Possessor phrase is not overtly realized (the Possessor remains implicit, hence the name), and it must be inferred from the context:

Belarusian

6. *Maryjka   padnjala   ruku*
   Maryjka.NOM   raise.PST.F.SG hand.ACC.SG
   'Maryjka raised **her** hand' [lit. 'Maryjka raised hand']

7. *Tanja   razmaŭljala   z   maci*
   Tanja.NOM   chat.PST.F.SG   with mother.INS.SG
   'Tanja had a chat with **her** mother' [lit. 'Tanja had a chat with mother']

As the translation of the examples above shows, English does not allow implicit Possessors. In the languages which do have them, typically, only inalienable possessed entities, typically body-parts (as in 6.) and relatives (as in 7.) are allowed to appear in such expressions.

2.3 'Having' and 'belonging': Two sides of the possessive relation

Within the field of internal predicative Possession, a further distinction must be drawn, namely between 'having'- and 'belonging'-constructions[12]. Heine claims, that this distinction is universal: "all languages known to us have conventionalized means for expressing it" (Heine 1997:33).

The two constructions are represented by the following English examples (Heine 1997:29):

  a. Peter has a car   'Having'-construction
  b. The car is Peter's *or* The car belongs to Peter   'Belonging'- construction

---

[12] Benveniste (1966) speaks of 'possession' (*posséssion*, 'have') and 'belonging' (*appartenence*, 'belong').

The two constructions differ in many respects. First of all, they assign different pragmatic roles to the Possessor and the Possessee. In a., the Possessor ('Peter') is the topic and the Possessee the comment. In b. the roles are reversed: the Possessee ('the car') is the topic, while the Possessor ('Peter') is the comment.

In English the difference between the two constructions is explicitly marked at the lexical and syntactical level: in the first case the verb *have* is used, in the second case either the copula *be* + a genitive adjunct or the verb *belong*. As far as the syntactic structure is concerned, in a. the Possessor is given the status of subject, while in b. it has the status of object. Moreover, the Possessee is formally marked as indefinite in a. ('a car') and as definite in b. (' the car'). As far as English is concerned, thus, 'having'-constructions may be described as expressions where the Possessor is the clausal topic, has the status of subject and is typically definite, while the Possessee is the comment, has the status of object and is typically indefinite. 'Belonging'-constructions, on the other hand, may be described as expressions, where the Possessee is the clausal topic, has the status of subject and it is typically definite, whereas the Possessor represents the comment and has the status of an object (it may indifferently be definite or indefinite).

Now, all these properties may not be shared by other languages. First of all, not all languages include the possibility to formally mark the definiteness/indefiniteness of a noun phrase. Moreover, in some languages, the Possessee has the same syntactic roles in both 'having' and 'belonging' constructions. As Benveniste (1966:196) shows, this is the case in Latin: in both cases the Possessee is coded as a subject, while the Possessor is coded as a dative (8a.) or as a genitive adjunct (8b.).

Latin

8. a. *Mihi   est   liber*   'Having'-construction
      I.DAT   be.PRS.3SG book.NOM.SG
      'I have a book'

   b. *Meus   est   liber*   'Belong'-construction
       my.NOM.SG   be.PRS.3SG   book.NOM.SG
      'The book is mine'

As said above, it has been argued that the main difference between the two constructions lies in the pragmatic roles (Possessor as topic and Possessee as comment and vice versa): "we will treat the distinction between the two kinds of constructions as being pragmatically motivated" (Heine 1997:30). However, even pragmatic roles cannot be a reliable criterion. Let us consider the following Lithuanian sentences:

Lithuanian

9. a. *Petras   turi   automobilį*   'Having'-construction

   Peter.NOM   have.PRS.3   car.ACC.SG

   'Peter has a car'

   b. *Automobilis   yra   Petro* ,   or   'Belonging'-constructions

   car.NOM.SG   be.PRS.3   Peter.GEN

   'The car is Peter's'

   c. *Automobilis priklauso   Petrui*

   car.NOM.SG belong.PRS.3   Peter.DAT

   'The car belongs to Peter'

   d. *Automobilį turi   Petras   (o   ne Jonas)*   'Having'-construction

   car.ACC.SG have.PRS.3 Peter.NOM   (and   not John.NOM)

   'It is Peter who has a/the car (and not John')

As the example in 9d shows, in Lithuanian, the Possessee may be topical in expressions of 'having,' too.

Because of such difficulties in formalizing the distinctive criteria between the two constructions, Stassen concludes in claiming that "it seems that there is no universally applicable formal criterion by which instances of 'definite' ['belonging'] and 'indefinite' ['having'] predicative possession can be distinguished" (Stassen 2009:30).

However, two criteria, the one semantic and the other formal could be found useful in distinguishing between expressions of 'having' and expressions of 'belonging'.

The first is represented by the different behaviour of 'having' and 'belonging' constructions with reference to sentential emphasis (see Watkins 1967:2194). Considering the Lithuanian examples reported above, it is possible to notice a difference between the sentences in 9b. and 9c. and the one in 9d.: in the first two, the emphasis is on the Possessee, while in the third it is on the Possessor. Even if in 9d. the Possessee is formally the topic (a condition usually reserved to expressions of 'belonging') the informative purpose of the sentence still conveys information about the Possessor, and not about the Possessor, as the English translation shows: 'the car is John's' vs. 'it is John who has the/a car'.

The second criterion is referred to the nature of the predicate. The predicate in expressions of 'having' is, typically, existential, whereas it is usually copular in expressions of 'belonging': "the verb used in ['belonging'] constructions is usually the copula for that language. The verb in ['having' constructions] is usually the same as the verb in the existential" (Clark 1978:102-105).

This criterion, though being formal, cannot be applied to all languages, and it is therefore not universal: thus, it does not contradict Stassen's claim reported above. At any rate, the contraposition

'copula : existential verb' in, respectively, 'belonging' and 'having' constructions is surely valid in Indo-European languages[13]. Most of them have a unique lexeme for both verbs, as English *be*. Irish Gaelic, conversely, still has two different lexemes: the existential *ta* 'be' is opposed to copular *is* 'be' in, respectively, 'having' and 'belonging' constructions: *is aí* 'is his' versus *táith-i* 'is to.him = he has'(Watkins 1967:2192; Clark 1978:104). The presence of a copular verb in expressions of 'belonging' leads to the conclusion formulated by Stassen (2009:30), that "cases of definite predicative possession often take the form of identity statements" (see also Watkins 1967:2192).

The Indo-European verbs for 'have' have often be described as being locative-existential in nature[14] (Baron and Herslund 2001b:85; Holvoet 2005:148ff): hence, predicative 'have' constructions may be considered as a variety of existential constructions (Holvoet 2005a:148).

The constraposition "existential *versus* copular" sentences can be observed in Belarusian and Lithuanian too.

Belarusian, as already mentioned, uses a construction based on the predicate *byc'* 'be' to express Possession, namely, *u* 'at' + Gen.: *u mjane **byla** mašyna* 'I had a car' [lit. 'at me was car]. Now, *byc'* is used in 'belonging'-constructions as well: *mašyna **byla** maja* 'the car was mine' [lit. 'car was mine']. However, there is a difference between the two predicates, even if they are formally coincident. In the first case, *byc'* has an existential meaning, while in the second, it is a copula. This may be easily verified. In Belarusian, when existence is negated, the subject is encoded in the genitive case; Conversely, when identity is negated, the subject remains in the nominative case (it may also take the instrumental case, but not the genitive; the same in Lithuanian, see Holvoet 2005a:148ff.):

Belarusian

    10. a. *Ne   bylo   pryhožych   mašynaŭ*
          NEG   be.PST.N.SG nice.GEN.PL   car.GEN.PL
          'There were no nice cars'

      b. *Tyja   ne   byly   pryhožyja   mašyny*
          this.NOM.PL NEG be.PST.PL   nice.NOM.PL   car.NOM.PL
          'Those were not nice cars'

---

[13] But not only: see Turkish *var* 'exist', used in 'have' constructions (Lyons 1968:395), and other examples quoted in Clark (1978:102ff).

[14] A lexical proof of that may be found in those languages where 'have' is used to express existence (cf. French *il y a*, it there has, 'there is'; Spanish *hay*, has, 'there is'). In some languages, such as Russian, Belarusian, Danish (for the latter see Baron and Herslund 2001a) a reflexive form of 'have' has acquired an existential meaning: Russian *imet'sja*, have.REFL, 'to be (there); to be present, available', Belarusian *mecca* 'id.'.

Now, in expressions of 'having' the negated subject takes the genitive case too, whereas in expressions of 'belonging' it remains in the nominative case:

Belarusian

11. a.　*U mjane ne　bylo　　mašyny*
　　　　at I.GEN　NEG　be.PST.N.SG car.GEN.SG
　　　　'I did not have a car', 'I had no car'

　 b.　***Mašyna***　*ne　byla　　maja*
　　　　car.NOM.SG NEG　be.PST.F.SG my.F.NOM.SG
　　　　'The car wasn't mine'

In conclusion, we can state that, at least in the case of Belarusian and Lithuanian, in expressions of 'having' the Possessor is given emphasis and the predicate is existential, while in expressions of 'belonging' the Possessee is given emphasis and the predicate is copular (and, therefore, the sentence is a statement of identity).

Finally, a further remark about 'belonging' constructions must be made. Heine states that they "usually have ownership as their primary or even their only meaning" (Heine 1997:32). This claim is certainly justified when we look at lexical items such as the English *belong,* Belarusian *prynaležac'* 'belong', Lithuanian *priklausyti* 'id.'. As far as Indo-European languages are concerned, predicative genitive constructions are also, generally, limited to the expression of ownership, and cannot be used to express Inalienable Possession, or Temporary Possession: *the watch is mine*, ?*the blue-eyes are mine, *Tom's book is mine*. However, an expression of Abstract Possession like *your problems are mine, too* is perfectly acceptable: this seems to demonstrate that 'belonging' constructions may be used for notions other than ownership as well, even if their primary function is to express ownership.

In Lithuanian and Belarusian we can found a whole range of constructions that show a formal characteristic of 'belonging' constructions, that is a copular predicate[15], but that are never used to express ownership:

Lithuanian

12.　*Jis　　**man**　　tėvas*　　　　　　　　　Social Possession
　　　he.NOM　I.DAT　　father.NOM.SG
　　　'He is my father (or: 'he is a father to me')'

---

[15] Hence its absence in the present tense, where, in both Belarusian and Lithuanian, the overt expression of the copula is not obligatory.

Belarusian

13. ***Jamu*** *imja* *Jan*   Abstract Possession

        he.DAT   name.NOM.SG Jan

        'His name is Jan'

However, I would not define such constructions as 'belonging' ones, even if here the predicate 'be' is a copula. First of all, in expressions of Social Possession such as the one represented in 12. the relational nature of the substantive determines the fact that the emphasis is not only on the Possessee but it falls on the Possessee and the Possessor in equal measure. Secondly, the sentences represented in 13. evidently wants to be informative about the Possessor ('what is his name?') and not about the Possessee (*'whose is this name?'). That the Possessor is the real topic is also proved by the fact that the usual word order of 'belong' constructions in Belarusian (PE - PR) is reversed (PR - PE).

Therefore, even though such constructions present a copular predicate, I would not define them as 'belonging' constructions.

2.4 The typology of possessive constructions: Considering Heine (1997) and Stassen (2009)

It has been said above (1.1) that, in many unrelated languages of the world, possessive and locative constructions formally coincide, and that this fact has led some linguists to hypothesize that Possession is in reality a form of Location. Yet, the typological research has pointed out that locative expressions are not the only source for possessive constructions. English *have* itself, for instance, does not, diachronically, originate from a locative construction, but rather from an agentive one: it derives from a verb originally meaning 'hold', which has successively been grammaticalized into a possessive predicate.

Heine (1997) and Stassen (2009) have – although with different criteria- built a typology of the encodings of possessive (predicative) constructions in the languages of the world, listing, respectively, eight and four different derivational patterns.

2.4.1 Heine's model: The 'source schemas'

In his fundamental work about the encoding of predicative Possession, Heine (1997) chooses a cognitive approach to explain the variety of possessive constructions found in the languages of the world. According to him, in order to express such an abstract and complex notion like Possession, human conceptualization "turns out for help" to other conceptual domains, like Location, Accompaniment and others (see below) and, through a process of translation, metaphorization and

extension, "converts" constructions originally devoted to the expression of these notions into possessive ones. So, the concept of 'I have something' can be expressed as 'something is located near me' (source domain: Location), 'something is my usual companion' (source domain: Accompaniment).

Theoretically, any conceptual domain could be a source for possessive expressions, yet cross-linguistic evidence has showed that this is not the case. According to Heine, only four conceptual domains are eligible for this purpose: Action, Location, Accompaniment and Existence. It follows that languages express the concept of 'having something' in terms of *doing something* (Action), *being located somewhere* (Location), *being accompanied by someone/something* (Accompaniment) or, finally, *existing (in relation to someone)* (Existence), but not, let us say, as *someone causes something to happen* (Cause).

The different conceptual patterns which lie at the origin of possessive constructions are labelled by Heine as 'source schemas'. The fact that every language may choose a different (or more than one) schema to derive its possessive constructions explains the variety in their encoding in the languages of world. As Heine points out, the process which leads an originally locative, agentive, comitative or existential construction to be converted into a possessive one is not to be read only as a conceptual process, but also, on a linguistic level, as a grammaticalization one:

> 'at the initial stage, the expression concerned exclusively denotes the literal meaning of the source schema. Subsequently, the expression is increasingly used in contexts which allow for a possessive interpretation until this interpretation becomes the primary and, eventually, the conventional one. Since, in the course of this process, both interpretations are possible, a situation of overlapping meanings arises, and it is only at the final stage, when the possessive meaning is conventionalized, that the expression can be interpreted exclusively with reference to possession.'
> (Heine 1997:77)

English *have* has terminated its grammaticalization process: its possessive meaning is completely established and no other interpretations are possible[16]. On the contrary, the Russian and Belarusian locative *u* 'at' + Gen. construction is still in the second stage. It has acquired a possessive meaning, which, in given contexts, even represents its primary meaning. Nevertheless, it may still be used to express Location:

Russian

    14. a. *U Ivana   novaja   mašina*

           At Ivan.GEN   new. F.NOM.SG car.NOM.SG

           'Ivan has a new car'

---

[16] Other functions of *have* in English, such as the functions of expressing modality (*to have to*) are derived from the possessive one, and are therefore, with respect to Possession, secondary developments.

b. *Moja   novaja   mašina   u Ivana*

my.F.NOM.SG   new.F.NOM.SG car.NOM.SG at Ivan.GEN

'My new car is at Ivan's place'

Heine presents a list of eight source schemas:

ACTION SCHEMA: X takes Y > X has, owns Y
(English)
I have a book

LOCATION SCHEMA: Y is located at X > X has, owns Y
(Russian)
U menja   kniga
At me.GEN book.NOM
'I have a book'

COMPANION SCHEMA: X is with Y > X has, owns Y; or X is with Y > Y has, owns X
(Khalkha, Mongolian-Tungusic, Altaic)
xür   daxa-tai
man.NOM   fur.COMITATIVE
'The man has a fur'

THE EXISTENCE SCHEMAS:

GENITIVE SCHEMA: X'sY exists > X has, owns Y
(Turkish)
Kitab- ım var
Book-my exist
'I have a book'

GOAL SCHEMA: Y exists for/to X > X has, owns Y
(Latin)
Est Johanni   liber
Is   Johannus.DAT   book.NOM
'Johannus has a book'

SOURCE SCHEMA: Y exists (away) from X > X has, owns Y
(Slave, Athabaskan, Na-Dene)
ts'ét'u   nets'e
cigarette   you.from
'Do you have cigarettes?'

TOPIC SCHEMA: as for X, Y (of X) exists > X has, owns Y
(Cahuilla, Uto-Atzecan)
né? né-pas   hìw.qal
I   my-older:brother he.live.DURATIVE
'I have a brother'

EQUATION SCHEMA: Y is X's (property) > X has, owns Y
(English)
The book is John's, mine

The criteria employed by Heine to build his typology are primarily cognitive and semantic: formal

criteria are "subdued" to the semantic ones. An example can help to clarify the practical

consequences of this choice. Heine classifies the Goal schema in a different category as the Locative schema, the difference between these two schemas lying not so much in the formal encoding of the Possessor (in some languages, both schemas may be realized through locative adjuncts, allative in the first case, adessive/inessive in the second case) but in the underlying cognitive representation. In the first case the possessive relation is represented as a *being for someone,* where the Possessor is a benefactive/experiencer or as *going towards someone*, where the Possessor is represented as the goal the Possessee must join. In the second case, the relationship is presented as a *being in/at*, where the Possessor is represented as the Location where the Possessee is situated. Therefore, even though in some languages in both cases the Possessor may be encoded as an oblique (an allative vs. an adessive), this formal characteristic is subdued to the semantic difference between the two expressions.

2.4.2 Stassen's model

Stassen (2009) does not accept the "prominence" of semantic criteria over formal ones proposed by Heine:

> 'for Heine, this difference in semantic/cognitive encoding of the two constructions is criterial in assigning these constructions to two different typological groupings.
>
> (1) Estonian (Uralic, Finnic)
> *Isa-l on   raamat*
> father-adess   3SG.be   book.NOM
> 'Father has a book' (Lehiste 1972: 208, quoted in Heine 1997: 51)
> (2) Kashmiri (Indo-European, Indic)
> *Ši:la-s   cˇhu   dod*
> S.-dat   cop   milk
> 'Sheela has milk' (Kachru 1968: 35–6, quoted in Heine 1997: 59)
>
> However, in the majority of modern typological studies, the practice has been to abstain from semantic criteria in the construction of a typology. The reason for this is that, in this majority view, linguistic typology is seen as an endeavour that has the aim of establishing the range of variation in the formal encoding of a given semantic/cognitive domain. That is, linguistic typology studies the various ways in which a given semantic/cognitive content can be mapped onto the formal, morphosyntactic structure of natural languages. It will be clear that, under such meta-theoretical presuppositions, it will not be appropriate to employ anything else than formal criteria in the construction of the typology. As a result, the difference in meaning between the case suffixes that mark the possessor in the Estonian and the Kashmiri constructions can be viewed as typologically irrelevant. In this particular case, one might want to say that, in both languages, the possessor is marked as part of an adverbial phrase, and that this fact is criterial in subsuming the two constructions under the same type in the typology. In this book, I will adopt the majority practice in modern typological linguistics, and hence I will not employ semantic/cognitive criteria in the construction of my typology.'
> (Stassen 2009: 39-40)

Thus Stassen, having decided to give prominence to formal criteria instead that to semantic ones, builds a different typology, based on the syntactic encoding of Possessor and Possessee. According to him, the predicative possessive constructions that are to be observed in the languages of the world can be reduced to four syntactic patterns only:

> **LOCATIONAL POSSESSIVE**: *At/to Possessor (there) is/exists a Possessee*
> 'the construction contains a locative/existential predicate, in the form of a verb with the rough meaning of 'to be'; The Possessee NP (PE) is constructed as the grammatical subject of the predicate. […]; The possessor NP (PR) is constructed in some oblique, adverbial case form […]' (Stassen 2009:40-50);

> **WITH-POSSESSIVE**: *Possessor is/exists with a Possessee*
> 'the construction contains a locative/existential predicate, in the form of a verb with the rough meaning of 'to be'; the possessor NP (PR) is constructed as the grammatical subject of the predicate; The Possessee NP (PE) is constructed in some oblique, adverbial case form' (*ibid:*.54);

> **TOPIC POSSESSIVE**: *(As for) Possessor, Possessee is/exists*
> 'the construction contains a locative/existential predicate, in the form of a verb with the rough meaning of 'to be'; The Possessee NP (PE) is constructed as the grammatical subject of the predicate; the possessor NP (PR) is constructed as the sentence topic of the sentence' (*ibid*:58);

> **HAVE-POSSESSIVE**: *Possessor has a Possessee*
> 'the construction contains a transitive predicate; the possessor NP is constructed as the subject/agent; the Possessee NP is constructed as the direct object/patient' (*ibid:*63).

Undoubtedly, both Heine's and Stassen's model are extremely well-grounded and solid, with reference to both their explanatory force and theoretical coherence. However, in this work, I have decided to adopt Heine's approach rather than Stassen's one. First of all, I agree with Heine's theory about the role of conceptual transfer in the grammaticalization of possessive constructions and with the decision of including also semantic factors in his typology. Then, Heine's approach offers also a more fine-grained schema that accounts not only for syntactic, but also for semantic differences. Such a fine-grained distinction is of much help when it comes to the analysis of the role different possessive construction fulfil in one language.

It must be reminded, however, that Stassen explicitly avoids going deeply into the semantic differences within one language: his aim is to build a universal typology of the possible encodings of Possessor and Possessee in the languages of the world. Therefore, his approach is on purpose modelled in such a way, to be the as convenient as possible to this specific aim. When it comes to the analysis of even subtle semantic differences between possessive constructions in the same language, conversely, his model might yet not be the most useful.

As it will be showed further, in Lithuanian, two constructions are found, that are used for completely different purposes. In the first the Possessor is encoded as a dative, as in ***man dvidešimt metų***, me.DAT twenty years, 'I am twenty-year-old'. In the second, it is encoded as a genitive: ***Onos***

žalios akys, Ona.GEN green eyes, 'Ona has green eyes'. Now, in Stassen's classification both these types would be accounted for as Locational Possessive. I reckon, though, that the fact of distinguishing between them is more useful to understand the role these construction play in Lithuanian, for they fulfil different functions: the first is used to express mainly Abstract and Social Possession (see 5.5), the second may also be used for the expression of Inalienable Possession (see 5.12).

Of course, it would also be theoretically possible to accommodate Stassen's model to a specific linguistic situation. In the aforementioned case, the different syntactic encoding of Possessor and Possessee in Lithuanian (dative vs genitive) is a sufficient formal criterion to distinguish two types of possessive constructions, even without taking semantic differences into account. The main reason for accepting Heine's model, thus, is that I am persuaded by his representation of the cognitive processes that leads different languages to encode Possession in the way they do.

Thus, even though I will frequently refer to the fundamental work by Stassen, I will analyse the Belarusian and Lithuanian data with reference to Heine's source schemas.

2.5 The source schemas: a survey

2.5.1 Action schema

The Action schema – corresponding to the 'Have'-Possessive in Stassen's classification – is very familiar to every speaker of English, as it provides this language with its major possessive strategy - the verb *have.*

Possessive constructions resulting from the Action schema are quite "odd", if compared to the ones resulting from any other one of the remaining schemas. In fact, in instances of the Action schema the predicate is a transitive verb[17], diachronically deriving from verbs like 'hold', 'catch', 'seize' (Heine 1997:48), the Possessor has the syntactic role of subject and the Possessee of object. On the contrary, in the constructions deriving from the other possessive schemas the predicate is, invariably, an intransitive locative, copular or existential verb, the Possessee is encoded as the subject and the Possessor as an adjunct (dative, locative, comitative) or a modifier (genitive), or as a Topic.

---

[17] It should be remembered that *have,* even if formally a transitive verb, does not share much with "real" transitives. As Benveniste (1966) points out, *have* does not express an agentive process, causing the object to undergo some changes, as normal transitives do. Quite conversely, *have* predicates a state, and it should be therefore interpreted as a stative (and not as a verb of action). Moreover, *have* cannot be passivised, though it may have, in some languages, a reflexive form: in Belarusian, for instance, *mecca* 'have.REFL' is used to express existence; the same in Danish (Baron and Herslund 2001a:6). Thus, the grammatical subject of *have,* even if it is given the formal encoding of an Agent in transitive constructions, has much more in common with Experiencers and Locations (Baron and Herslund 2001a: 4-5).

As for its geographical distribution, the Action schema is attested in every continent, even if in some parts of the globe (as in Asia) it is practically unknown (Stassen 2009:64; 248). Contrarily to what might be thought, when considering only Western Europe, this is not one of the most diffused schemas in the world (Heine 1997:50).

As far as Europe is concerned, Haspelmath (2001:1495) considers the presence of a possessive perfect formed with 'have' (which obviously presupposes the presence of a 'have'-verb) as one of the characterizing features of the Standard European Average (SAE). In fact, in Western-Central Europe, the area the SAE languages belong to, the Action schema is the most diffused strategy for the encoding of Possession. The spreading of 'have'-verbs in the Indo-European languages of Europe might be the result of an areal convergence (see the discussion in Heine 1997:138ff).

2.5.2 Location schema

In instances of the Location schema, the predicate is represented by an intransitive verb, either locative, copular or existential. In some languages, even postural verbs like 'stand' or 'sit' can be used (Heine 1997:51). The Possessor is always represented as the Location the Possessee is situated at (near, in). Neither Heine nor Stassen mention any instance of a structure like 'Possessor is at the Possessee' (contrary to what happens in instances of the Companion schema, which are attested in both the variants 'Possessor is with Possessee' and 'Possessee is with Possessor'). Probably, there are two reasons why it is the Possessor – and not the Possessee – that receives the role of Location. Firstly, languages usually employ locative expressions such as 'to be at one's place' or 'to be in one's body-part', where the Location needs to be human (Heine 1997:53), as in Ewe (a Niger-Congo language):

Ewe

    15. *xɔ*   *le* *è-sí*
    house be his-hand
    'He has a house' [lit. 'the house is in his hand']
    (Heine 1997:52)

Secondly, it may be supposed that, since typical Possessors are human beings and typical Possessees are inanimate entities, the choice of encoding the Possessor and not the Possessee as the Location is derived from the necessity of avoiding ambiguity. In fact, humans (which are the typical Possessors) are far less likely to be understood as real locations. Conversely, if the structure were 'Possessor is at/in Possessee (which is usually an inanimate entity)' expressions like 'he is in the

house' or 'he is at the table' would probably have too high a rate of ambiguity between a possessive and a locative interpretation.

It could be also ventured that, from a cognitive point of view, the basilar possessive concept of "something being in my domain of control" is much better represented by expressions like "something is near to me; something is in my hand" as by their reverse "I am near something".

The Location schema is, according to Stassen, "the prominent option in Eurasia and northern Africa, as well as in Polynesia and the northern part of South America." (Stassen 2009:54). Within Europe, the Location Schema is found in the Western and in the very North-Eastern periphery of the SAE area. It represents the major possessive strategy in many Celtic languages (Orr 1992), East Slavic and Finnic languages.

2.5.3 The Companion schema

The Companion schema is attested in two variants: 'Possessor is with Possessee' and 'Possessee is with Possessor'. The first one is the cross-linguistically most diffused. The second one, which is very rarely found, seems rather to be a source of 'belonging'-constructions rather than of 'having'-ones (Heine 1997:57).

Taking the variant 'Possessor is with Possessee' for the canonical one, it is interesting to observe that it seems to represent the exact opposite of the Location schema (Stassen 2009:55): *Possessee is at Possessor* versus *Possessor is with Possessee*.

It may be supposed that, just like instances of the Location schema, the constructions derived from the Companion schema have an iconical value as well: it makes much more sense to take the Possessor as the unmovable reference point, and to enumerate the items s/he has *with him/her* rather than representing the situation the other way round.

Geographically, the Companion Schema is diffused in all continents, especially in Sub-Saharian East Africa, where it represents the prominent option (Stassen 2009:246). In Europe, the Companion Schema is not very important as a strategy for the expression of predicative Possession, but this schema is a major source for attributive Possession: *the man **with blue eyes**; people **with much money***.

2.5.4 The Goal schema

In instances of the Goal Schema the Possessor is encoded as a dative/benefactive, or as a goal case (allative) expression (Heine 1997:57), and the Possessee as the grammatical subject.

It has been argued, on the basis of evidence from early Indo-European languages, that Proto-Indo-Europeans used a dative construction to express Possession (Bauer 2000:194). Nowadays, traces of

the Goal Schema – which is realized in Indo-European languages, either through a dative case or through a dative/allative marker as English *to* - can still be found in several European Indo-European languages. In Latvian, a Baltic language, it even represents the only option of encoding predicative Possession (opposing its cognate Lithuanian, which has developed a 'have'-verb, as it will be shown in the following chapters).

Outside Europe, the Goal schema is attested in the Asian branches of Indo-European, as well as in some African, Asian and South American languages (Heine 1997:60).

2.5.5 The Genitive and Equation schemas

In both these schemas, the Possessor is encoded as a genitive, and as the grammatical subject of the predicate. However, the two schemas are deeply different. In the Genitive schema, the Possessor is encoded as a modifier of the Possessee, and the predicate expresses existence ('*the Possessor's Possessee exists*'). In the Equation schema, on the contrary, the Possessor and the Possessee are encoded in two different constituents, and the predicate is copular: '*The Possessee is Possessor's*'. Heine states that the Genitive Schema always gives birth to 'having'-constructions, while the Existence schema always generates 'belonging'-constructions (Heine 1997:91-2).

Stassen claims that the Genitive schema (he calls it 'Adnominal Possessive') is, cross-linguistically, a rarer strategy for the encoding of Possession, if compared to other types (Stassen 2009:112). Most frequently, it is encountered in Asia: for instance, in the Indo-European languages of Asia, such as Armenian, Hindi, Bengali, Old Persian[18], and in some Uralic and Altaic languages, such as Turkish and written Mongolian (*ibid*.).

The Equation schema is present in all European Indo-European languages, where it represents, together with lexemes such as English *belong*, the major source of 'belonging'-constructions.

2.5.6 The Source schema

Typical instances of the Source Schema are represented by expressions where the Possessor is encoded as an ablative adjunct, and the Possessee as the subject of a locative/existential verb: *'from Possessor is Possessee'*.

As Heine states, the Source schema appears to be "virtually irrelevant" as a source for predicative Possession (Heine 1997:64). In the Indo-European languages of Europe, the Source schema represents one of the most important sources of attributive possessive constructions: in fact, the

---

[18] Modern Persian and other modern Iranian languages have developed a 'have' verb deriving from Old Iranian *$d\bar{a}r$- 'to hold' Edel'man 1975:151ff.). Other Iranian languages have not developed it, and they express possession by means of a 'be'-based construction (*ibid*.).

Indo-European genitive case forms or genitival prepositions (such as English *of*, German *von* and the Romance results of Latin *dē* 'from') are derived originally from ablative expressions[19] (Heine 1997: 146). This is also the case of Greek, Slavic and Baltic: "in Greek and Slavic the Genitive and the Ablative (which in the Singular were for the most part identical already in proto-Indo-European times) have merged completely" (Brugmann 1922:435, quoted in Stassen 2009:125; for Baltic genitive forms see also Dini 1997:80).

2.5.7 The Topic schema

In the possessive constructions resulting from the Topic schema, the Possessor is codified as the clausal topic, appearing mostly in a sentence-initial position, while the Possessee is encoded as the grammatical subject of the predicate, which usually is a locative/existential verb: '*As far as the Possessor is concerned, the Possessee exists*'.

The Topic schema is not attested in Europe, yet it is the major option of encoding Possession in Asia, and it is diffused in Oceania, North and South America as well (Stassen 2009:247).

2.6 Possessive constructions and possessive notions: a typological outline

One point still needs to be clarified: Is it possible to establish a correlation between possessive notions and source schemas? In other words, is there any cross-linguistic evidence that a particular strategy is preferably associated with the expression of a particular possessive notion?

Heine answers this question stating that, even if there is linguistic evidence proving that any one of the schemas may be used to express all possessive notions, some generalizations can be made:

(i)   The Location Schema is most likely to be associated with physical and temporary possession.
(ii)   The Existence schemas again, that is, Genitive, Goal, and Topic, are more likely to be associated with permanent and inalienable possession.
(iii)   The Companion Schema is claimed to be more likely to express physical and temporary, or, more generally, alienable possession rather than inalienable possession.
(iv)   Finally, there is a strong negative correlation: the Existence schemas are very seldom recruited for the expression of physical possession.
(Heine 1997:92-3)

According to Stassen, the 'have'-strategy is likely to be associated with the expression of temporary Possession, and he even formulates a universal principle:

'if a language employs a Have-Possessive for the encoding of alienable possession, it will employ a Have-Possessive for the encoding of temporary possession [...]. On no account [...] is

---

[19] The development of genitival forms from ablatives is quite a diffused option in the world, see Stassen 2009:123ff

it possible that, for example, the subdomain of alienable possession receives a Have-Possessive encoding while the subdomain of temporary possession does not.'
(Stassen 2009:63-4)

Languages often use different strategies to express different possessive notions. Standard Russian sets a clear example of this. It disposes of a locative strategy, involving the construction *u* 'at' + Gen.', and of a 'have'-one with the verb *imet'* 'have'. Whilst the locative strategy may be used to express all possessive notions, *imet'* is specialized in the expression of Inanimate and Abstract Possession, and it is very rarely used to express possessive notions other than these two[20]:

Russian

16. a. ***U Ivana***   *mnogo*   *deneg*
       at Ivan.GEN   much.ADV money.GEN.PL
       'Ivan has much money' (ownership)

    b. *Naša*   *vselennaja*   ***imeet***   *neopredelënnuju*   *formu*
       our.NOM.SG   universe.NOM.SG have.PRS.3SG indefinite.F.ACC.SG   shape.ACC.SG
       'Our universe has an indefinite shape' (Inanimate Possession)

As it will be shown in chapters 5 and 6, also in Belarusian and Lithuanian different constructions are dedicated to the expression of different possessive notions.

---

[20] However, *imet'* represents a suppletive form for the locative construction *u* + Gen. when an indefinite form of the verb is needed (gerund, participle). Moreover, as Guiraud-Weber and Mikaeljan (2004:65) show, the use of *imet'* has greatly increased in the last decades in the language of the media and in colloquial speech.

Part II

Predicative Possession in Belarusian and Lithuanian

Chapter 3. Belarusian and Lithuanian in context

Belarusian and Lithuanian, just like almost every language in the world, are not isolated entities, but are inserted in several contexts. I understand here the term 'context' as comprising of all the situations that have contributed to shape these two languages to be the way they are today: their genetic affiliation, their geographical position (and consequent contact with neighbouring languages) and the socio-historical processes that the community of the Belarusian and Lithuanian speakers have experienced.

Belarusian and Lithuanian indeed have much in common, as far as all these contexts are concerned. First of all, they are genetically close to each other: they are both Indo-European languages, belonging to two groups, Slavic and Baltic, which originate from the same dialectal branch of the proto-language and which are very close to each other (Meillet 1924:7).

Second, these two languages are inserted in the same areal context, the 'Circum-Baltic Area' (Dahl and Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2001), which is called so because it roughly comprises of the region around the Baltic Sea.

Finally, in the last few centuries, both Belarusian and Lithuanian – albeit to a different extent – have been the objects of a Polonisation and a Russification policy. This has had enormous consequences on the development of these two languages.

In order to understand some of the phenomena that will be presented in the following pages, it is necessary to correctly place Belarusian and Lithuanian in their context. This is the aim of the present chapter. First, a brief survey of the way the other Slavic and Baltic languages and other languages of the Circum-Baltic area express predicative Possession will be made. Then, the socio-linguistic situation in Lithuania and Belarus' will be presented, together with some data about the standardisation process of the two languages.

3.1 The expression of Possession in Baltic and Slavic

As said above, Belarusian and Lithuanian belong to the same linguistic family – the Indo-European one – and also to two closely related groups – Slavic and Baltic. The topic of the Balto-Slavic relationships has always been quite popular among Indo-Europeanists, and several theories have been proposed to explain the evident similarities on the morphosyntactic and lexical levels between these two groups (see Dini 1997 for a survey of this question[21]).

---

[21] The bibliography about the topic of the Balto-Slavic relations is immense. Some reference works are Vaillant 1950, Bernštejn 1974, Senn 1966, Birnbaum 1979, Čekmonas 1988.

A possible explanation is to postulate a common Balto-Slavic proto-language that would have been spoken after the dissolution of the Indo-European unity. This theory has already been defended by Schleicher, and, more recently, by Vaillant (1950): "the abundance of common features, even striking, as the determined inflection of adjectives, makes evident the existence of a period of Balto-Slavic unity, which, much after the Indo-European unity [dissolved], lasted until a quite recent date" (Vaillant 1950:14; my translation). Toporov and Ivanov (1958) accept the hypothesis of a period of Balto-Slavic unity too. They explain the split between Baltic and Slavic by representing the latter as a group of peripheral Baltic dialects which found themselves "cut off" from the central dialects and therefore developed independently.

Meillet (1924), conversely, excludes the hypothesis of a common proto-language, as well as the hypothesis of a fortuitous parallel development; resulting in convergence (this hypothesis had also been advanced). He supposes, instead, that Slavic and Baltic influenced each other through contact:

> 'Baltic languages originate from the same Indo-European dialectal group as the Slavic languages. They have been spoken in a region near the Slavic domain and communications have been frequent between the two groups. The similarities between the two groups are striking. Yet, this is not sufficient to suppose a "Baltic-Slavic unity". Undoubtedly, Baltic and Slavic have many identical or similar innovations […] but as in all the analogue cases, one needs to consider [external] influences and borrowings. The recent ones are evident and it is easy to recognize them, but there could also be even more ancient ones. All similarities which are observed between Slavic and Baltic do not imply a common language or parallel independent developments.'
> (Meillet 1924:7-8; my translation)

It is beyond the scope of this work to examine in detail all these theories. For our purposes, however, it is sufficient to note that – independent from the fact whether a Balto-Slavic common proto-language existed or not – Slavic and Baltic languages are genetically very close to each other, as they belong to the same linguistic family and, within it, to the same dialectal branch. This may explain some of the structural similarities between Belarusian and Lithuanian in the field of the expression of Possession. For instance, the fact that, in some particular cases, both languages encode the Possessor as a dative (instead of coding it, let us say, as a genitive or an instrumental) is not casual, but is, most probably, an inherited characteristic.

3.1.1 The expression of predicative Possession in Baltic

As far as the expression of predicative Possession is concerned, Baltic languages can be neatly divided into two groups. The first includes Lithuanian and Old Prussian (nowadays extinct), which dispose of a 'have' predicate (Lith. *turėti,* Old Pr. *turīt*), representing the main possessive strategy in both languages. In the second group only Latvian is found: this language does not have a 'have' verb, and it uses instead a dative construction, an instance of the Goal Schema:

Latvian

17. *Man   ir   māja*
     I.DAT   be.PRS.3   house.NOM.SG
     'I have a house'
     (Holvoet 2001a:203)

According to Vykypěl (2001), the dative strategy, nowadays represented in Latvian only, should be considered as the original Common Baltic construction: Lithuanian *turėti* and Prussian *turīt* are, therefore, later innovations. The arguments Vykypěl brings in to support his theory are indeed quite convincing. First of all, he points out that there is linguistic evidence (both from the dialects and from the standard language) that Lithuanian *turėti* had formerly the meaning of 'hold' (which, in some cases, it still has, as in the expression *turėti ką už ranką* 'to hold someone's hand). The development of 'have'-verbs from verbs meaning 'holding' is a typologically known phenomenon, as already shown (see ch.2). It is reasonable to suppose, thus, that this development has taken place in Lithuanian (and Old Prussian) too. Moreover, in Lithuanian there are still traces of the old possessive dative to be found, both in the dialects and in the standard language. In Latvian, on the contrary, even in the oldest documents, no occurrences of *tverti* 'hold' (cognate to Lithuanian *turėti*) used in possessive function are found.

It must also be remembered that Proto-Indo-European itself has often been claimed to use dative constructions to express Possession: dative possessive constructions are attested in all old Indo-European languages, while no unitary 'have' verb can be reconstructed for the proto-language (Bauer 2000:194, Baldi and Cuzzolin 2005:27). The conclusion that Latvian has preserved the inherited construction, whereas the two other Baltic languages have innovated, is, therefore, logic. To explain the conservatory behaviour of Latvian, Vykypěl invokes contact with Finnic languages. Since in these languages Possession is expressed through a locative construction involving a 'be' predicate, contact with them could have either prevented Latvian from developing a 'have' verb as Lithuanian and Prussian did, or it could have stopped the process of development, provided it had begun.

3.1.2 The expression of Possession in Slavic

It has been supposed that Common Slavic, like Common Baltic, used a dative construction for the expression of Possession (Danylenko 2002; Holvoet 2003a,b; Clancy 2010:128-129). As far as Late Common Slavic is concerned, there is evidence to affirm that, together with the dative possessive

construction, a 'have' verb must have also been present, as well as the adessive construction *u* 'at' + Gen. (Mirčev 1971, Vasilev 1973, Clancy 2010:130, McAnallen 2011).

In Old Church Slavonic both possessive dative constructions and the verb *iměti* 'have'[22] are attested (Vaillant 1977:87-88; Kurz 1969:208), even if the latter is much more frequently used than the former (McAnallen 2011:156). Sporadically, a third construction is used too: the adessive construction *u* 'at' + Gen. (Mirčev 1971:81).

As far as the role of *iměti* in Old Church Slavonic texts is concerned, Isačenko (1974:50) claims that "the numerous constructions with *iměti* which are to be found in Old Church Slavonic texts are without exception loan-translations from Greek constructions with *'échein* ['have']". Yet, Mirčev (1971), Danylenko (2002) and McAnallen (2011) provide arguments against Isačenko's view.

First of all, they show that the correspondence between Slavic 'have' and Greek 'have' is not always perfect: sometimes Slavic uses a dative construction to translate a Greek 'have'-verb, and sometimes Slavic uses its *iměti* to translate an original Greek possessive dative (Mirčev 1971:80ff, Danylenko 2002:113ff). Moreover, an occurrence of *iměti* is found in the Novgorodian birch-bark letters too, for which no interference from Greek can be hypothesised (Danylenko 2002:114-115). Finally, descendants of Late Common Slavic *jьměti* may be found in all modern Slavic languages, which suggest us of a form inherited from the common proto-Slavic language. On account of all this, it is possible to conclude that *jьměti* was, most probably, already available as a means of expressing Possession in Late Common Slavic:

> 'given that there was some free variance in Slavic and some preference of one construction or another in different situations, and not merely a slavish adherence to the Greek original, it is possible that Old Church Slavonic *jьměti* 'have' was already established as a verbal expression for ['Possession'] before the Christian missionaries came to the Slavic territories and conscripted it for translation duty.'
> (Clancy 2010:130)

Nowadays, 'have' verbs constitute the major option for the expression of Possession in the West and South Slavic languages, whereas the 'have' strategy competes with the adessive strategy *u* + Gen. in East Slavic (Mrázak 1990:44). In all Slavic languages vestigial traces of the old possessive dative can still be found (*ibid.*:46), cf. for instance:

---

[22] *Iměti* is a clear instance of the Action Schema, as it derives from Common Slavic *jьměti, *jьmatь 'have', which, in its turn, traces back to Proto-Slavic *jěti, *jьmǫ 'take'. To the same Common Slavic root *jьměti, *jьmatь derive all 'have'-verbs in modern Slavic languages, including Belarusian *mec'*. In East Slavic both forms with initial –i (Russian *imet'*) and without (Bel. *mec'*, Ukr. *maty*) are found. Isačenko ascribes the origin of the Belarusian and Ukrainian forms to the influence of Polish, defining them as "a curious Polish-Russian hybrid" (Isačenko 1974: 50), but, as showed by Danylenko (2002), they are most probably of East Slavic origin, and devloped independently from the West Slavic forms (Polish *mieć*, Czech *mít*, etc.).

Slovenian

18. *Ime* **mu** *je* *Janek*
    name.NOM.SG he.DAT be.PRS.3SG Janek
    'His name is Janek'

Czech

19. *Je* **mi** *dvacet let*
    be.PRS.3SG I.DAT twenty year.GEN.PL
    'I am twenty-years-old'

Old Polish

20. **Dziecięciu** *było* *siedm lat*
    child.NOM.SG be.PST.N.SG seven year.GEN.PL
    'The child was seven-years-old'
    (Holvoet 2003b:466)

Ukrainian

21. *Vse* **tobi** *bude,* *poterpy*
    all.PRN.N.NOM.SG you.SG.DAT be.FUT.3SG be_patient.IMP.2SG
    'You will have it all, be patient'
    (Mrázak 1990:46)

As mentioned above, in East Slavic languages the 'have' strategy and the adessive construction *u* 'at' + Gen. are concurrent, although the use of these two constructions is not uniform throughout the East Slavic territory. In Russian, the adessive construction *u* + Gen. is the most frequent strategy. The 'have' strategy is quite marginal, and its use is subdued to several syntactical and semantic constraints (Safarewiczowa 1964; Guiraud-Weber and Mikaeljan 2004). Conversely, 'have' has a much more important role in Belarusian and Ukrainian, where the two strategies are really competing with each other (that is, speakers, in most contexts, have the possibility of choosing either one of the two constructions). In Rusyn, finally, the picture is quite complicated, depending on which one of the four standardised variants of the Rusyn language[23] is considered (Kushko 2007:124).

The particularity of East Slavic (and particularly Russian) *vis-à-vis* the other Slavic languages has been frequently ascribed to language contact, namely, to contact with Finnic (*inter alia*, Veenker 1967:118). In most Finnic languages of the area neighbouring with the Slavic territories, in fact, an adessive construction has been grammaticalized into a possessive one:

---

[23] Contemporary Rusyn has been standardised in four variants: the Transcarpathian, Slovak, Lemkian and Vojvodinian.

Finnish

22. *Minulla   on   kirja*
     I.ADESS be.PRS.3 book.NOM.SG
     'I have a book' [lit. 'On me (there) is book']
     (Veenker 1967:118)

However, the hypothesis that *u* + Gen. is a specific East Slavic phenomenon, a mere semantic calque from Finnish, cannot be actually accepted. Traces of possessive *u* + Gen. are found in Old Church Slavonic, Old and Middle Bulgarian and Old Serbo-Croatian (Mirčev 1971:81-82, Vasilev 1973). Moreover, traces of *u* + Gen. used with a possessive meaning can still be observed in the Modern Western and South Slavonic languages (with the exception of Sorbian and Slovenian, Vasilev 1973:365ff.):

Czech

23. *Rukav   **u košile***
     sleeve.NOM.SG at shirt.GEN.SG
     'Shirt sleeve'
     (Vasilev 1973:366)

Polish

24. *Po serbsku   to   co   powiedział,   jeszcze   lepiej*
     in Serbian.N.LOC.SG this.N.NOM.SG what.REL   say.PST.M.SG still   better.ADV
     *brzmiało: „Izvolte.   Slabe   żiwce".   A   **u mnie***
     sound.PST.N.SG   excuse.IMP.2PL weak.F.ACC.PL nerves.ACC..PL and   at I.GEN
     te   żywce   jeszcze słabsze
     this.NOM.PL nerves.NOM.PL   even   weaker.F.NOM.PL
     'In Serbian, what he said sounded even better: "Excuse me. Weak nerves." But my nerves were even weaker [lit.: 'but **at me** these nerves even weaker']'
     (http://korpus.pl/poliqarp/poliqarp.php?context=169)

Serbo-Croatian

25. ***U koga***   *ima   ljubavi   za narod*
     at who.REL.GEN.SG have.PRS.3SG love.GEN.SG   for people.ACC.SG
     'Who has love towards the people' [lit. 'at whom has (= there is) love for people']
     (Kordić 1999:203)

It is reasonable, therefore, to suppose that *u* + Gen. was used with possessive functions already in Common Slavic (McAnallen 2011:156, Clancy 2010:130). Finnic influence, thus, should not be considered as having induced East Slavic to create *ex novo* a possessive construction on the model

of the Finnic adessive. Rather, it should be seen as having helped in strengthening the frequency of the use of this construction, which was already available to the speakers of Slavic for the expression of Possession.

According to Prochorova (1991:45), the Northern Russian dialects (the ones spoken in territories neighbouring Finnic-speaking populations) were the first to extensively use *u* + Gen. with a possessive function. This usage successively spread into the Belarusian and Ukrainian territories.

3.2 The expression of Possession in the languages of the Circum-Baltic Area

As already mentioned, the area where Belarusian and Lithuanian are spoken has been labelled as the 'Circum-Baltic area' (henceforth: CBA; Dahl and Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2001). The CBA goes approximately from Germany to Russia, and from the Ukraine to Cape North (*ibid*.:xvi).

Since prehistoric times the CBA has been inhabited by ethnic groups speaking different languages - mainly belonging to the Indo-European (Germanic, Baltic and Slavic groups) and to the Ugro-Finnic family (Finnic group). This prolonged contact has given birth to several instances of linguistic convergence, on account of which some scholars have proposed to consider the CBA as a *Sprachbund* (Mathiassen 1985; Stolz 2001; about the development of this hypothesis, see Koptjevskaja-Tamm and Wälchli 2001:622ff).

Mathiassen (1985) proposes to consider the Eastern Baltic area (he does not consider the Germanic languages) as a 'passive *Sprachbund*'. This label indicates a *Sprachbund* where those cases of linguistic convergence are not ascribed to an active transfer of one language to another, but are instead considered as a 'passive' preservation of genetically inherited models (*ibid*.:277). The role of Finnic influence on the preservation of the Latvian possessive dative may be seen as an example of this "passive" transfer.

Mathiassen underlines the difficulties in determining the exact quality (and quantity) of the linguistic contact in the CBA:

> 'we ignore the exact nature of cultural and language contacts in the Baltic area in more remote periods. One is faced with the likelihood that there are several layers of language constellations, like those of Russian dialects with neighbouring Finn-Ugric languages and the impacts of German on Latvian and that of Polish on Lithuanian (and to some extent *vice versa*). All these different layers and intermingling tendencies have obscured the whole picture and made our judgement difficult. Each separate contact layer may, perhaps, most frequently have been *bilateral* (binary), but will have been overlayered by other (possibly also bilateral) constellations. This process will have resulted in tri-or multilateral constellations which would be called *Sprachbund* in the sense we use this word.'
> (Mathiassen 1985:280; italics by the author)

Koptjevskaja-Tamm and Wälchli (2001), who agree with Mathiassen's intuition of several contact layers, however, suggest avoiding the notion of *Sprachbund* when referring to the peculiar situation in the CBA. Instead, they propose the notion of *Contact Superposition Zone*:

> 'our guess is that intensive micro-contacts superimposed on each other sometimes create an impression of an overall macro-contact among the languages in an area, which has not been necessarily there. We believe that the notion of Sprachbund tends to overemphasize the overall macro-contact, which might, of course, be justified in certain specific areas. For the CB Area (and others comparable to it in the actual complexity of linguistic contacts), we suggest the term **Contact Superposition Zone**.'
> (Koptjevskaja-Tamm and Wälchli 2001:626; evidence by the authors)

The choice of considering the CBA rather as 'Contact Superposition Zone' has the advantage of not considering the whole area as an *unicum,* in which given isoglosses are supposed to be found largely and given convergence-induced processes are supposed to act uniformly. Instead, the fact of considering "intensive micro-contacts" leads to the necessity of examining each one of the isoglosses firstly, as induced by a direct, micro-contact, and only successively as the result of a general development trend acting on the whole area.

As far as the expression of predicative Possession is concerned, the languages of the CBA can be divided into four groups:

a) languages with a 'have'-verb as their major strategy (Action schema): all the Germanic languages of the area, Polish (West Slavic), Lithuanian, and, partially, Belarusian and Ukrainian;

b) languages using a locative strategy (Location schema): Finnic languages, Russian and, partially, Belarusian and Ukrainian;

c) languages using a dative strategy (Goal schema): Latvian and Curonian Livonian (Finnic);

d) anguages using a genitive strategy (Genitive Schema): Mordvin and Mari, two Finnic languages.

3.3 Belarusian and Lithuanian in contact

As said above, the CBA is characterized by several micro-contact areas and bi-lateral contacts. The 'Lithuanian–Belarusian contact zone' (Wiemer 2004), which can be roughly identified with the political border between Lithuania and Belarus', is one of them. In this area, several sub-varieties such as Lithuanian dialects, Belarusian dialects, the *polszczyna kresowa* 'the Polish language of the borderlands' (a local variety of Polish), the Russian dialect of the Old Believers and (especially in the last decades) standard varieties (Russian, Lithuanian, Polish, in a lesser extent Belarusian) as well have been, and still are, in a situation of intense contact and diffused multilingualism, which has caused several contact-induced linguistic changes to take place (see also Zielińska 2004, Wiemer 2004, 2003b).

The influence Lithuanian and Belarusian have had and still have on each other is generally limited to the dialects, whereas the standard languages did never much interact between one another. However, in standard Belarusian some features can be individuated, which have probably arisen in consequence of contact (either in the form of a substratum or of a diffused multilingualism) with Baltic.

The use of a preposition meaning 'for, in quality of' in comparative constructions is one of them. As Wiemer (2004:505) points out[24], the use of preposition meaning 'for, in quality of' in this function is typical for the Lithuanian-Belarusian contact zone, but it is rather 'exotic' from a 'standard European' point of view. Typically, European languages use either an ablative construction (like the Russian genitive) or a particle (like English *than*) in comparisons. On the contrary, Lithuanian uses the preposition *už* + Acc. 'for, in the place of'(26.):

Lithuanian

26. *Jis   geresnis   už   mane*
    he.NOM better.M.NOM.SG for I.ACC
    'He is better than me'

In standard Belarusian, though the "European" strategies (the bare genitive and the particle *čym* 'than') may be found as well, the most frequent option in comparative constructions is the preposition *za* 'for, in the place of', as in Lithuanian:

Belarusian

27. *Ën   lepšy   za   mjane*
    he.NOM better.M.NOM.SG for   I.ACC
    'He is better than me'

Cekanne and *dzekanne* [25], two phenomena so typical of Belarusian phonology, are supposed to have been caused by language contact with Baltic as well. They are also found in the Lithuanian South Aukštaitian dialects, spoken in the region directly neighbouring on Belarus'. It has therefore been

---

[24] In this work, the author labels the meaning of the preposition *už* as 'behind'. However, as the author himself has successively pointed out (B. Wiemer, p.c.), this preposition means 'behind' only when followed by the Genitive case: *už namo*.GEN 'behind the house'. The same is valid for Belarusian *za* too, that means 'behind' when followed by the Instrumental case: *za chataj*.INSTR 'behind the house'. Both *už* and *za*, when used with the Accusative case, acquire the meaning of 'for; in the place of', and it is precisely in this meaning that they have been grammaticalized for the use in comparative constructions.
[25] The labels *cekanne* and *dzekanne* denote the affrication of dental plosives [t] and [c] before [i], [e], ['a], ['u], ['o]. Compare Russian *tëtja* [tʲotʲa], Belarusian *cëcja* [cʲocʲa] 'aunt'; Russian *den'* [dʲenʲ], Belarusian *dzen'* [dzʲenʲ] 'day'.

supposed that, from these dialects, they have spread into Belarusian (Balode and Holvoet 2001:59). However, the hypothesis has also been advanced, stating that the change actually took place the other way round (that is, Belarusian influenced the South Aukštaitian dialects (*ibid.*)), or that the two processes occurred independent of one another (Filin 1972:312).

As said above, at any rate, the mutual influence of Belarusian and Lithuanian is quite reduced, at least as far as the standard language is concerned. Conversely, as it will be shown below, standard Russian has had quite a strong influence on both languages.

3.4. The sociolinguistic context of Belarusian and Lithuanian: a brief survey

In order to understand the linguistic phenomena that will be described in the next pages, it is necessary to introduce the peculiar socio-linguistic and historical conditions in which Belarusian and Lithuanian have developed and in which they still are developing. As it will be shown below, both Belarusian and – to a lesser extent – Lithuanian have evolved in a situation of diffused multilingualism. Both languages, albeit to different extents, have been subjected to a heavy Russification. In the case of Belarusian in particular, its still uncertain standardisation, its ambiguous social and political status and the fact that the concept of "native speaker" applies only partially to the members of the Belarusian-speaking community contribute to create a confused situation that must always be considered when approaching Belarusian data.

3.4.1 The development of Lithuanian: external influences and puristic tendencies

The literary Lithuanian language throughout its history has experienced a strong influence from its Slavic neighbouring languages: first from Polish and Ruthenian (a bookish East-Slavic language with a Belarusian basis, Shevelov 1974:148ff), then, especially in the Soviet time, from Russian[26].
The written history of Lithuanian[27] officially dates back to 1547, when the first Lithuanian book was published. Both Polish and Ruthenian had a great influence on the language of this first period: the books written in Lithuanian were mainly translations from Polish (often mediated through Ruthenian), and loanwords and grammatical calques from Slavic were very frequent (Dini 1997:279ff). Slavic (Polish, Russian, Ruthenian) continued to have a great influence on Lithuanian throughout the 18th and the 19th centuries (Dini 1997:359).

---

[26] In the Soviet period, the influence of Russian has extensively invested the spoken language as well, whereas in the previous periods only part of the Lithuanian speakers were in contact with Slavic speakers.
[27] In the following, under the label 'Lithuanian' only the Aukštaitian (High Lithuanian) dialects are to be understood, which form the basis of the contemporary standard language. The Samogitian (Low Lithuanian) and the "Prussian" dialects and their literary tradition have not been taken into consideration. More on this topic in Balode and Holvoet (2001).

The written language of this first period (16th to the first half of 19th century), however, had no influence on the standardisation of Lithuanian as we know it today. The standardisation process of modern Lithuanian began in the second half of the 19th century, since 1880s onwards. An effort was made to "clean up" the newly standardised language from Slavic influences; avoiding borrowings from Slavic languages and syntactical constructions that might have been borrowed from Slavic (Balode and Holvoet 2001:44). Yet the influence of Russian, in the form of both morphosyntactic calques and lexical borrowings, could not be avoided during the Soviet period (1940 to 1991), when Lithuanian was massively exposed to it, and when the Soviet authorities carried out an explicit policy of Russification. Russian influence was not limited to the written language (as it had been the case in the previous century; Čekmonas 2001), but it spread to the spoken language as well, even if to different extents in the countryside and in the urban centres:

> 'the conditions of life in the Soviet society […] did certainly not protect the rights of the national languages. Their role was reduced more and more, becoming almost superfluous. In fact, beside the knowledge of the mother tongue, knowledge of Russian was necessary everywhere; the number of social functions that could be carried out only in Russian was gradually increased and in the schools and universities more and more subjects were taught in Russian […]. The bilingualism mother tongue-Russian in the Baltic Republics (as in all other Republics) grew without interruptions during the whole Soviet period. Because of the obligatory two years of military service, the knowledge of Russian among men arrived up to 61,7%, whereas among women it stopped at 38,3%. The knowledge of Russian was more diffused in the urban centres and in those regions, where the ethnic composition was not uniform, as Russian often served as a means of interethnic communication […]. Russian was favoured through control over specific areas of use, such as school […], the media (in particular television), and the above mentioned obligatory military service.
> (Dini 1997:366-7; my translation)

As a consequence of the intensive contact with Russian and also of a language policy that explicitly aimed at making Lithuanian more similar to Russian (Zinkevičius 1996:321), many loanwords entered in Lithuanian and several idiomatic calques were formed. Russian influence extended to all fields of the language: phonology, morphology, syntax and lexicon (Zinkevičius 1996:321ff., Dini 1997:369):

> 'most mistakes in the use of cases and prepositions are due to the interference of neighbouring languages – first of all Slavic languages. [In the past] many Slavic syntactic constructions have been unnecessarily introduced in Lithuanian. […] The close contacts with Russian and the diffused bilingualism during the last half century of Soviet rule have had a quite bad influence on the spoken language (and particularly on the language spoken by urban population). The mistaken use of cases and prepositions because of external influences is very dangerous, as it destroys the foundations of the language, its whole system.'
> (Šukys 1988:52; my translation)

After the independence, in 1991, a second wave of "de-slavicization" (after of the one of the 1880s) of Lithuanian has taken place, mostly with a puristic attitude. The warnings Šukys makes about the

danger of the mistaken use of cases and prepositions may be an example of such an attitude. Zinkevičius' words, reported below, are an example as well (his work, it must be said, is somehow biased by an excessive nationalistic zeal). The concepts invoked by Zinkevičius - "language culture" (Lith. *kalbos kultūra*, i.e. a conscious use of the "correct" language), the necessity of "teaching the 'proper' language", the "inflicted damage" - are typical of a puristic approach:

> 'people [i.e. linguists, teachers, L.M.] have devoted a great deal of their attention to practical problems of language culture and have tried to undo some of the damage inflicted on Lithuanian and neutralize the effects of Russification. In spite of all these efforts, language culture did not markedly improve at first. To the contrary, for a time it continued to decline spurred by its own inertia. Correct and proper Lithuanian had to be taught to the greater part of the population. It did not seem likely that the fundamental turning-point in the people's perception of Lithuanian would be reached quickly. The hope lies with the younger generation, which will grow up in an independent Lithuania.'
> (Zinkevičius 1996:332).

I have often encountered such a puristic attitude in many of the informants I have consulted when writing this work. Most of them have stigmatised the use of constructions that are clearly calqued from Russian (such as, for instance, the adessive construction *pas* 'at' + Acc. used to express Possession, a calque from Russian *u* + Gen., see 5.4) even if these are actually quite diffused in the colloquial speech of Lithuanian native speakers, and not only in the Lithuanian speech of native speakers of Russian.

Nowadays Lithuania is ethnically and linguistically quite homogenous. Lithuanian enjoys the status of the official language and it is the native tongue of the majority of the inhabitants of the Republic of Lithuania. In the region of Vilnius, however, multilingualism is still diffused: standard Polish, standard Russian, *polszczyzna kresowa* and Belarusian dialects are spoken (see Porayski-Pomsta and Čekmonas 1999). Moreover, there are still, particularly in urban centres, Russian and Polish-speaking minorities: for them, Lithuanian represents a second language. This fact must always be kept in mind when considering Lithuanian data (see also 4.4).

3.4.2 Belarusian: an introduction

The present socio-linguistic conditions of Belarusian are decidedly peculiar. Although this language shares with Russian the role of co-official language of the Republic of Belarus', it fulfils a minority role in the public sphere of life. Russian is the language of the administration, of the television, radio and press; most schools have Russian as teaching language. Even in private life, only a little minority of ethnic Belarusians usually speak in this language: the overwhelming majority is Russian-speaking.

Moreover, Belarusian is codified in two different standards: the official one, the so-called *narkamaŭka*, used in the Republic of Belarus', and the non-official one, the *taraškevica*. The first is indeed well-codified, but heavily Russified (Bieder 2000). As for the *taraškevica*, conversely, no normative grammar exists. The *taraškevica* is also not allowed to be used in publications in Belarus': it is most diffused among the Belarusian diaspora (in the United Kingdom, Canada, United States, Germany). The two standards differ in many respects: mainly orthography, but also lexicon, morphology and even syntax (Mayo 1978, Bieder 2000)[28].

It is clear that all these factors – the minority role of Belarusian in the Belarusian society, and its still instable standardisation – form quite a confused picture that cannot be ignored, on pain of misunderstanding the linguistic data. Therefore, in the following sections a brief survey of the history of the Belarusian standard language and of the socio-linguistic conditions in which it has developed will be presented.

3.4.2.1 Language policies in Belarus' and the standardisation process of modern Belarusian

Throughout its recent history, Belarusian has been the object of language policies aiming at confining the language to the sphere of private life. If we give a glance to the contemporary Belarusian society, we can conclude that these policies have reached their goal, and have even surpassed it: Belarusian is barely used even in private life, except for the rural zones (and not in all of them).

During the time of the Granduchy of Lithaunia – the state where Lithuanians and East Slavs (ancestors of the modern Belarusian and Ukrainians) lived together since the 14th century - a form of bookish East Slavic, with a clear Belarusian basis, was used in the territories of contemporary Belarus' for administrative purposes. This language ("Ruthenian"[29]) may be considered, under certain conditions and with many constraints, to be the first form of a literary Belarusian, even if heavily influenced by Polish and Church Slavonic. In 1667, however, Ruthenian was replaced with

---

[28] Actually, a third orthographic system exists as well: the so-called *biełaruskaja łacinka*. It is just a variant of the *taraškevica* standard, written in Latin characters. The sounds [ʃ], [tʃ], [ʒ] (cyr. ш, ч, ж) are represented as *š, č, ž*, while [sʲ], [cʲ], [zʲ'] (cyr. *сь, ць, зь*) as *ś, ć, ź*. The non-palatal /l/ [l] is represented as *ł*.
Part of the classical Belarusian literature was written using the *łacinka* (even though in different variants), but nowadays it is not used much, neither in Belarus' nor abroad among the diaspora. However, there is a number of Belarusian intellectuals who would like to establish the *łacinka* as official orthography, or, at least, as the official transliteration for Belarusian Cyrillic alphabet.
[29] The question, how this language is to be denominated, is quite complex. Due to its Belarusian linguistic features, it is sometimes called "Old Belarusian" (so in the Belarusian linguistic tradition). Karskij (1921) calls it 'West-Russian language'. Other denominations are 'West Russian Chancellery language' (Stang 1935); 'Ruthenian' (Shevelov 1974), 'West Russian' or 'Chancellery language' (Waring 1980), *ruski* (Dini 1999). See Danylenko 2006 for a survey of this denomination problem.

Polish in the role of official language of the Lithuanian-Polish Commonwealth, born in 1569 with the fusion of the Polish State with the Granduchy of Lithaunia.

Since this time, and until 1918, Polish, and later Russian, would be used as official languages in the territories of contemporary Belarus', and the production in Belarusian was almost reduced to zero (see Šakun 1960; Sipovič 1973). Polish authorities carried out a policy of a strong Polonisation, that did not extensively affect the rural population, but that led to the almost complete Polonisation of the aristocracy. When the territories of contemporary Belarus' became part of the Russian Empire, in 1795, the situation of Belarusian did not change much, unless maybe to an even worse condition. Russian substituted Polish as the administrative language, and the czarist authorities began a policy of massive Russification[30]. Unfortunately, it is beyond the purposes of this work to present the complex linguistic situation in the Belarusian territories in the 15th-19th centuries. What must be said, however, is that the contemporary perception of Belarusian as the "peasants' language"[31], not worth of having a literary status nor a literature written in it, perception shared by many Belarusians, has its roots in the czarist and Soviet propaganda, which had aimed at proposing Russian as the common literary language of all East Slavs .

The standardization process of Modern Belarusian began only at the very beginning of the 20th century, when the Belarusian national movement started its activities, attempting to reinforce, or even to create *ex novo*, a Belarusian national consciousness. The first step towards a national identification was, obviously, the reinvigoration of the language. The publication of the periodical Naša *Niva*, 'Our Cornfield' (1907-1915), represented one of the milestones in the history of Modern Belarusian. The editors of *Naša Niva* gave particular attention to the language of their authors, trying to avoid too marked dialecticisms and trying to find "compromises" between the different variants, in which Belarusian was written at the time (Nadsan 1967).

The language of *Naša Niva* was still not, however, a satisfactory standard. It was not even a real standard, as it lacked a codified variant and it was full of lexical borrowings from Polish and

---

[30] The liquidation of the Uniate Church, on the 25th March 1839, may be seen as part of this process, which aimed at the assimilation of Belarusians from a linguistic as well as from a cultural point of view. The Uniate Church (so called because it came into existence in 1696 through the "Union of Brest", and alternatively known as Greek-Catholic Church) was born from the acceptance, by the part of some Ruthenian (Belarusian and Ukrainian) Orthodox bishops of the primate and the authority of the Pope. As a consequence, the Uniates retained the Byzantine rite but entered, in all effects, in the communion of the Catholic Church. Unlike the Roman Catholic priests, who used primarily Polish both in the predication and in paraliturgical prayers (the liturgical language was, at that time, only Latin) and unlike the Orthodox ones, who used Russian, Uniate priests used, probably, Belarusian in both predication and paraliturgical prayers (Sipovič 1973.:33, fn.19, 2). After 1839 Uniates had to decide between becoming Catholics (as most of them did) or Orthodox.

[31] During the "period of silence" of the Belarusian literature (17th-19th cc.) some texts in Belarusian were found in the comic interludes of dramas written in Polish, where noblemen speak in Polish and peasants in Belarusian: this may give us an idea of the sociolinguistic distribution of Belarusian and Polish at the time. Interestingly, this distribution, and the consequent conception of Belarusian as the "peasants' language" survives still nowadays: in the cities Russian is decidedly predominant, whereas Belarusian is mostly spoken on the countryside.

Russian. Therefore, some literates – mostly schoolteachers – took on the task to try to finally codify Belarusian. The first "normative" grammars and orthography manuals appeared in the 1910s. The most important of them, the *Bielaruskaja hramatyka dlja škol* ('Belarusian grammar for schools') by B. Taraškevič, was published in Vilnius in 1918. In this work the author chose the dialects of the Vilnius region to be the basis for his codification (Sjameško 1995:23).

After the Second World War, Belarus' found itself divided in two parts: West Belarus' became part of Poland and East Belarus' of the USSR. In West Belarus' a strong policy of Polonisation was carried out, and Belarusian was given only a very marginal role in public life. To the contrary, in East Belarus', from 1918 to 1930, a process of *belarusizacyja,* 'Belarusisation', took place and Belarusian became the co-official language along with Russian. In schools lessons were taught in Belarusian and a project for a definitive codification of the language was started. However, in 1930, when Stalin's persecutions began, the process of *belarusizacyja* came rapidly to an end. Those who had participated in the process of codification of the language and, more generally, in the revival of Belarusian culture were charged as being 'national-democrats' and, therefore, also as enemies of the Revolution. Then, as punishment, they were either shot or sent to Siberia. A new codification project, with new participants of a stronger "revolutionary" faith, was started afterwards, and in 1933 the new Belarusian orthography came officially into use. The dialects chosen as basis for the new standard were the ones of the Minsk region (Central Belarus').

The "1933-reform", as it is known in the Belarusian linguistic tradition, however, was not merely an orthographical reform: It codified also morphology and syntax. It must be noted that the reform had not only linguistic aims, but it also quite openly aimed to achieve a Russification of Belarusian. Orthography, morphology, word formation, syntax and lexicon were codified in such a way that they be as close as possible to the Russian model (Mayo 1978:26-7; Bieder 2000:653).

The standard resulting from the 1933-reform is known as *narkamaŭka* (from **Narodny Kam**isaryjat *Asvety* 'Department of Education', the institution that had promoted the codification project), and it is still in use in Belarus' (see 3.4.2.). The reform, of course, was accepted only in East Belarus': it follows that, until 1945, Belarusian developed into two distinct variants, as in West Belarus' the old *taraškevica* standard (from the name of Taraškevič, who had codified it) was used. In 1945, after the annexation of West Belarus to the USSR, the *narkamaŭka* became the official standard in the entire country[32].

The intensive Russification policy did not stop throughout the whole Soviet period. There was more and more of pushing Belarusian away from the public sphere of use (Bieder 2000:358). In an always increasing number of Belarusian schools, especially in urban centres, lessons were taught in

---

[32] More exhaustive surveys about the reforms of the Belarusian orthography are Mayo 1975, 1978; Sjameško 1995; Žuraŭski 1998; Bieder 2000, Bušljakoŭ et al. 2005.

Russian, as well as in all Universities throughout the country. In the 1980s in Minsk there were no high schools with Belarusian as teaching language[33].

3.4.2.2 The double Belarusian standard: *taraškevica* and *narkamaŭka*

It has been said above that Belarusian is codified in two variants, the *taraškevica* and the *narkamaŭka*. From a linguistic point of view these two standards differ from one another on all levels: orthography, morphology, syntax, and, most of all, lexicon (Mayo 1978, Bieder 2000, Gutschmidt 2000).

As far as orthographic rules are concerned, the most striking difference between the two standards is represented by the 'weak sign' (Bel. *mjahki znak*, in Cyrillic ь <'>). It signals the palatalization of an alveolar fricative ([s], [z]) or of an alveolar affricate ([ts], [dz]) in the combination

C (alveolar fricative; alveolar affricate) - C (palatalized, non-velar)[34]

For instance, the initial /s/ in the word *sneh* 'snow', is actually pronounced [sʲ]: [sʲnʲeɣ]. This palatalization is graphically signalled in the *taraškevica* through the weak sign: *сьнег* <s'neh>. Conversely, the *narkamaŭka* does not signal it at all: *снег* <sneh>. In this account, the *narkamaŭka* follows the same orthographic rules of standard Russian (where the palatalization, also present, even if to a different extent, is not graphically signalled: Russian *снег* <sneg> [sʲnʲek]).

Other differences between the two standards concern case endings, some suffixes in word formation and the use of participial sub-clauses (accepted only in the *narkamaŭka*). Some of these differences are derived from the dialectal basis of each standard: the dialects of the Minsk region in the case of the *narkamaŭka* and those of the Vilnius region in the case of the *taraškevica*.

However, most of the differences between the two standards trace back to an ideological position: the *narkamaŭka* is oriented on the Russian standard and the *taraškevica* on the Polish one. As already mentioned, the *narkamaŭka* is nowadays the official standard in the Republic of Belarus'. The *taraškevica* (alternatively known in the Belarusian tradition as the *kl[j]asičny pravapis* 'classic orthography') has been used, after 1940, only by Belarusian writers in emigration (principally in Germany, USA and Canada). During the brief second wave of *belarusizacyja* (1991-1994) the *taraškevica* started to be used in Belarus' as well (mostly in periodical publications, as the newly grounded newspaper *Naša Niva*). A heated debate about which one of the two variants should be

---

[33] It must be remarked that the choice of the language of teaching was given to the parents: but, as there were no Universities in which lessons were taught in Belarusian, most parents chose Russian out of necessity, as it was the most prestigious and useful choice.
[34] The palatalization of the second consonant is graphically signalled through the following vowel, that is either a front vowel /e/, /i/ or a palatalized back vowel /'a/, /'o/, /'u/.

declared the official one went on in the country, with an enormous resonance on all levels of the Belarusian society. It did not only involve linguists and literates, but also politicians and even common people, who declared themselves in favour of one or the other variant. Sjameško (1995) and Bieder (2000) use the terms "reformers" and "traditionalists" to denote, respectively, the supporters of the *taraškevica* and the supporters of the *narkamaŭka*. The reformers accused the traditionalists of betraying the "cause of Belarusian" and of favouring an even greater Russification of the country. The traditionalists, in their turn, accused the reformers of substituting Russification with Polonisation, introducing in Belarusian artificial Polonisms (Žuraŭski 1998:12-15).

On the legislative level, the *querelle* has been definitely solved in 2008, when a new reform of the *narkamaŭka* standard had been accomplished and this had been proclaimed as the official standard of the Republic. The use of the *taraškevica* in public acts and documents had been consequently forbidden.

However, on an informal level, the debate still goes on. The supporters of the *taraškevica* consider the 2008-reform as an attempt to Russify Belarusian (and Belarus') even more. The polemic which followed the shift of the newly-grounded *Naša Niva* from the *taraškevica* to the *narkamaŭka* in 2009 is an exemplary representation of this debate. The editors of *Naša Niva* have explained the shift saying that; first, they were obliged to adopt the newly officialised variant. Second, they have claimed that the cause of Belarusian would be better served if *Naša Niva* uses the same standard taught in the schools and used it in the official press, as this would make it easier to all, even the Russian-speaking Belarusians, to read the newspaper. The reactions to the shift have been, anyway, very bitter, and some readers have even accused the editors of *Naša Niva* of cooperating with the Russification of Belarusian and Belarus'.

Nowadays, the *taraškevica* is still used by the Belarusian media abroad, like *Radyjo Svaboda*, that broadcasts from Prague and whose website is written in the *taraškevica,* and by some periodicals (usually anti-Governmental) in Belarus'. Of course, some Belarusians use it in their private life too. To this regard, it must be stressed that many of those, who decide to use the *taraškevica,* make this choice more because of an "anti-Russian", "anti-Government" and "pro-Belarusian" feeling than because of a linguistically aware choice[35]. Moreover, most of them have actually never learnt it. Therefore, they often write in a somehow "mixed" variant, combining elements from both standards. It must also be remarked that the *taraškevica*, even if its orthography has been newly codified in 2005 (Bušljakoŭ *et al.* 2005), still lacks a normative grammar. It follows, that a certain

---

[35] Traditionally, the Belarusian intellectuals who use the *taraškevica* would like Belarus' to get closer to Poland (or, better, to the European Union) and to draw away from the Russian sphere of influence. The present Belarusian Government, on the contrary, strongly defends the traditional close bonds Belarus' has with Russia (the choice of re-introducing Russian as official language, and, in general, the language policy of the Belarusian Government may be interpreted as an element of this pro-Russian policy).

degree of "freedom" and uncertainty in the use of case endings, verbal forms, syntactic constructions is inevitable.

3.4.2.3 The sociolinguistic situation in Belarus' at the present time

On 26th January 1990 a law (the "Law on the languages") defined the language policies which had to be carried out in the Belarusian Soviet Republic. Belarusian was made the official language, to be used in all spheres of social life, including education. Russian remained the official language of the USSR, but it was to be used only on the federal level.

After the independence, in 1991, Belarusian was declared the only official language, and this status was confirmed in the Belarusian Constitution promulgated in May 1994. Between 1991 and 1994 a second wave of *belarusizacyja* took place: lessons were taught in all schools in Belarusian only, and all official acts and documents had to be written only in Belarusian. However, this second *belarusizacyja* came rapidly to an end too. In May 1995, after the then President Lukašenka was elected, a referendum was held, in which the majority of Belarusians agreed to the reintroduction of Russian as the co-official language. Conceived as an act against the possible discrimination of the Russian-speaking minority, the referendum resulted actually in a step further towards the retention of the dominant role of Russian in Belarus' (Gutschmidt 2000:79).

In 1998 a new language legislation has been approved. According to it, Russian and Belarusian both enjoy the same rights: all public acts and documents may be written in either one of the two languages, and both must be taught in schools. In reality, the two languages are equal only on paper, as the figures on the languages used in educational institutions (kindergartens, schools, universities) strikingly demonstrate. According to official data, in the school year 2011-2012, Russian was used in 17,774 kindergartens, while Belarusian is used in 3,368 kindergartens only. The highest percentage of Belarusian-speaking kindergartens is found in the region of Minsk, where ca. 14,000 children are taught in this language. Instead, the lowest percentage is found in the city of Minsk, where just 3,000 children are taught in Belarusian (http://edu.gov.by/ru/main.aspx?guid=18021&detail=52563). As for school education, according to the data provided by the newspaper *Naša Niva* (13.03.2012), in 1995 40% of pupils of all schools and grades were taught in Belarusian. In 2004 this percentage sank to 23%, and, in 2009, it has dropped to 19%[36]. At the present moment, there is not a single University in the entire country where lessons are taught in Belarusian (except for courses on the Belarusian language and

---

[36] Even in the schools where Russian is the teaching language, Belarusian is, though, an obligatory subject. However, the effectiveness of the teaching of Belarusian is not always optimal. Some years ago, in Brest, I have met pupils of the final year of high school (aged around 17), who scarcely knew the names of the months in Belarusian. The younger pupils (aged around 10) seemed, however, to have a little better proficiency.

literature), and the knowledge of Belarusian does not represent a requirement for enrolment as a student in academic institutions.

In the last few years, a constant decrease in the use of Belarusian may be observed. According to official data, in 1999 the percentage of people who usually spoke Belarusian at home was 36.7%, against a 62.8% of those who spoke Russian. In 2009, the percentage of people that usually speak Belarusian has sunken to 23.4%, whereas the percentage of people that usually speak Russian has increased up to 70,2% (see table 1.).

	All population	Of total population persons who indicated as					
		mother tongue		language normally spoken at home		other language they have good knowledge of	
		Belarusian	Russian	Belarusian	Russian	Belarusian	Russian
Republic of Belarus	9 503.8	5 058.4	3 948.1	2 227.2	6 673.0	1 281.7	1 305.4
Region:							
Brest	1 401.2	751.9	597.4	374.2	982.4	209.6	236.1
Vitebsk	1 230.8	646.8	543.7	276.1	900.8	207.7	176.9
Gomel	1 440.7	786.4	602.8	326.4	1 037.6	154.8	166.5
Grodno	1 072.4	634.7	386.9	375.9	606.1	145.6	230.4
Minsk City	1 836.8	645.9	966.0	106.1	1 508.7	321.6	54.3
Minsk	1 422.5	987.2	390.5	553.0	796.6	127.4	343.9
Mogilev	1 099.4	605.5	460.8	215.5	840.8	115.0	97.3

Table 1.Population classified by knowledge of the Belarusian and Russian languages by region and Minsk City (thousand) (http://belstat.gov.by/homep/en/census/2009/pc_results.php)37

Interestingly, the region in which Belarusian reaches its highest percentage of use is the Minsk region, which also has the highest rate of rural population (http://belstat.gov.by/homep/en/census/2009/pc_results.php). On the other hand, in Minsk, the main urban centre of the Republic, Belarusian records its lowest rate of use.

---

[37] The fact of recognizing Belarusian as the 'mother tongue' has nothing to do with the effective everyday practice of the language, nor does it imply that Belarusian was the language spoken by the informants' parents. It is rather an ethnic definition (for ethnic Belarusians the mother tongue is Belarusian), which may well co-exist with an everyday practice of Russian.

What Gutschmidt wrote in 2000 about the linguistic situation in Belarus' is still valid:

> 'the linguistic situation in Belarus' at the beginning of the 1990s cannot be clearly defined as diglossic or bilingual [..]. With reference to a small group of speakers of Belarusian the notion of diglossy may be adequate, as Belarusian represents the language of given spheres (as, for instance, literary production, linguistics, literary studies), whereas Russian is used as language of the everyday communication. For a probably bigger group the notion of bilingualism should be used, as the choice of the language is determined by the communicative situation (and not by the text type), and, finally, the majority of speakers is definitely monolingual, namely Russian monolingual. Knowledge of Belarusian is not necessary even to read national literature. The most important works appear anyway in Russian translation too. In some cases (Vasil' Bykaŭ), it is the same author who publishes both the Belarusian and the Russian text (which are, moreover, not the exact translation of one another), and some famous writers (Svetlana Aleksievič) write only in Russian. It follows that there is almost no translated literature, classic works (both foreign and Russian classics), as well as trivial literature, are available in Russian only.
> At the beginning of the 1990s literary Belarusian is not polyvalent. Therefore, it lacks a relevant characteristic of a standard language. The consequence is the lack of an adequate terminology for several spheres of sciences, technique, economy, military sciences, etc. Because of the restricted use of literary Belarusian in everyday communication the concept of 'colloquial Belarusian' can be used only in a restricted sense.'
> (Gutschmidt 2000:77; my translation)

What Gutschmidt writes about the possibility of reading fictional works in Belarusian does still reflect the reality, even if in the last few years some publishers have begun to translate fictional and scientific works into Belarusian. Most of these books are still available for purchase only on the Internet or in dedicated shops, and they are not allowed to be sold in normal bookshops. Also, there are no films produced or doubled in Belarusian (but for some independent productions, not allowed to sale in shops in Belarus'), and most theatres have an exclusively Russian repertoire.

However, Gutschmidt's last statement does not completely fit to the present-day situation. In fact, even if the sphere of use of Belarusian in public life continues to be quite narrow, and its everyday use in private life is restricted as well, a certain revival of the language, most of all among young people, can be observed. Belarusian has conquered certain popularity on the Internet, where it appears as a very lively language: used in blogs, forums, on-line newspapers, and it has even developed its own youth slang.

The revival of the language among young people (mostly living in urban centres, and often politically "engaged" against the present Belarusian Government) has caused a singular phenomenon: a wave of "conversions" to Belarusian. Many young people, aged around 16-20, have decided over the last few years to "convert" to Belarusian and they have begun to use the language in everyday practice. Sometimes, they use it only in given situations: for example, at school and at home they speak Russian, whereas with friends they speak Belarusian (this might be described as a diglossic situation). The use of Belarusian is limited, in some cases, to the interaction with other Belarusian-speaking people. In other cases, though, the "conversion" is total, and Russian is no

longer used, even at school and even at home with Russian-speaking relatives and friends. It is interesting to see how, in the last decade, a whole range of web-sites dedicated to the study of the language are born. They often aim to help the "newly-converted" Belarusian speakers take their "first steps" in the world as Belarusian-speaking people: advising them on how and where they can find new Belarusian-speaking friends and by also helping them to solve their grammatical doubts.

It must also not be forgotten, that Belarusian still represents the main means of communication in some villages in rural areas. However, even in these zones Russian is diffused, as it is the language of television, radio broadcasts, and bureaucracy. Often, the language of communication is the *trasjanka*, a mixed Russian-Belarusian variety, a parallel phenomenon to the Ukrainian *suržyk* (see Hentschel and Zaprudzki 2008).

In conclusion, all these factors - the diffused bilingualism, the low prestige of Belarusian, the language policy pursued by Belarusian authorities, the pervasive presence of Russian and, finally, the existence of two parallel standards – depict an extremely instable situation. This instability may also be seen in the linguistic practice of native speakers, who are massively exposed to Russian in their everyday life. Indeed, interferences by Russian at all levels can be observed in the speech and in the writing practice of many speakers, especially those, who have grown up in a Russian-speaking family and have "converted" to Belarusian in their teen ages (or even later).

Chapter 4. The sources of the data: the Belarusian and the Lithuanian corpus

In this chapter the source of the data analyzed for this work will be presented. Most of the linguistic material I have analysed comes from two corpora, a Belarusian and a Lithuanian one. The corpus data have then been integrated with interviews to native speakers. Occasionally, data have been gathered from the Internet as well.

4.1 The Lithuanian corpus

The Lithuanian data analysed in this work are taken from the *Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos tekstynas*[38] ('corpus of the contemporary Lithuanian language'). In its original version the corpus contains 102,857,327 words. The version used in this work is smaller: it contains only 34,070,874 words, taken from 202 texts of various genres (Tab.2). All texts in the corpus have been published in the 1990s (1995 to 1997), and they are all representative of the standard language. Spoken language, as well as dialectal data, are absent from the corpus.

SECTIONS	WORDS	%	TEXTS
Magazines	18,322,974	53.8	119
Newspapers	13,963,966	41	58
Fiction (novels, short stories)	1,783,934	5.2	25
Total	34,070,874	100	202

Tab.2 The Lithuanian corpus (version used for this work)

4.1. The Belarusian corpus

At present[39], no corpus of Belarusian is available – neither online nor at any Institution. The only exception is the *Corpus Albaruthenicum,* a corpus of written Belarusian created at the Belarusian

---

[38] The corpus has been created by the researchers of the Centre of Computational Linguistics at the Vytauto Didžiojo University in Kaunas. The corpus is available online: http://donelaitis.vdu.lt/index_en.php.
[39] July 2012.

Academy of Sciences in Minsk, whose present dimensions (350,027 words), though, are far too small to provide reliable data[40].

The lack of a corpus is, certainly, a major problem for conducting a scientific research on Belarusian. I have tried to remedy this situation by building a corpus on my own. The criteria I have followed when choosing the texts have been 1) comparability with the Lithuanian corpus and 2) representativeness.

As far as the first point is concerned, I have tried to select, for my corpus, the same kind of textual genres that are contained in the Lithuanian corpus (in its original version: local newspapers, central newspapers, specialised press, non-specialised press, fiction, non-fiction (books), legal documents; http://donelaitis.vdu.lt/main_en.php?id=4&nr=1_1).

As for the second point, my corpus aims at representing a spectrum as large as possible of the varieties of contemporary written standard Belarusian.. Therefore, only texts written in the last two decades have been chosen. All texts in the corpus have been written in the period 1987 to 2010 (more than 80% in 2010), and they have all been produced and published in Belarus'. I have expressly avoided texts written in the Soviet period (just one short story from this period (1987) has been included). Texts produced by Belarusian authors of the diaspora have been excluded as well, as the language of the emigrants has its own particularities, the analysis of which would have gone beyond the scope of this work. I have also avoided translations: all texts have been produced directly in Belarusian.

As far as the standard is concerned, texts written in both *taraškevica* and *narkamaŭka* have been included in the corpus[41], with a slight preponderance of *narkamaŭka*. In the following, I have not systematically distinguished between them, but for the case a particular construction is found in only one of the two standards (like *mec'* + Inf., see further, 6.4.1).

The major sources of texts have been the national newspaper *Naša Niva* (in both its versions: before and after the shift from *taraškevica* to *narkamaŭka*) and the newspaper *Zvjazda* – written in *narkamaŭka* – which has a language very similar to the Soviet standard and which is, to a certain extent, Russified (the name of the newspaper, *zvjazda* 'star', itself is a proof of that: the word for 'star' in Belarusian is *zorka*, and *zvjazda* is the phonetically adapted version of Russian *zvezda*). The language of *Zvjazda* represents the language that is taught in schools and that is used in the official communication in Belarus'. Conversely, the language of Naša Niva, at least in its

---

[40] The *Corpus Albaruthenicum* is available on-line at the address: http://grid.bntu.by/corpus/index.php. A current project, carried on by U. Koščanka at the Belarusian Academy of Sciences, foresees a further development of the corpus, providing it with more texts and grammatical tags.

[41] In this work, the Latin transcription of the examples quoted in the texts will be made according to the standard they have been written in.

taraškevica version, resembles more the language of the Belarusian diaspora and it is not so Russified as the language of *Zvjazda* (occasionally, some Polonisms may be found).

SECTIONS	WORDS	%	TEXTS
National newspapers (*Naša Niva*, *Zvjazda*)	643,939	44.3	126
Non-fiction (essays: philosophy, sociolinguistics)	113,601	7.8	43
Fiction (novels, short stories)	361,841	24.9	33
Legislative texts	121,283	8.3	22
Magazines	67,045	4.6	11
Local newspapers	15,283	1.1	7
Non-fiction (books: history)	106,448	7.3	4
Memoires	25,078	1.7	1
Tot.	1,454,518	100	247

Tab.3 The Belarusian Corpus

4.4 The Internet

As far as I could, I have avoided using the Internet as a source of data. It is virtually impossible to control the identity and, in consequence, verify the linguistic competence of those who write on the Internet. Considering the particular socio-linguistic situation in Lithuania, this may pose a problem. It is quite important to know, in fact, whether the writer is a native speaker of Lithuanian or rather a native speaker of Russian or Polish (as said before, there still is a consistent minority of Russians and Poles in Lithuania). The latter, in fact, could introduce in his/her Lithuanian speech constructions, calqued from his/her native tongue.

In the case of Belarusian, conversely, the language of the Internet does not represent a particular problem. On the contrary, the Internet is nowadays one of the few places where Belarusian can develop freely. The linguistic competence of the Belarusians writing in Belarusian on the Internet is, at any rate, usually just the same as the competence of the journalists writing for newspapers: that means, they use a language that may be Russified to a more or less extent, depending on the

linguistic background of the author. In any case, in order to present consistent data for both languages, I tried to acquire data from the corpus more than from the Internet.

For both languages, data taken from the Internet have been considered in cases when the corpora did not furnish enough information, or when an analysis of the sub-standard, colloquial language was needed (particularly in Lithuanian).

In the following, examples taken from the Internet will always be signalled.

4.3. Native speakers

In order to have the results of the corpus analysis confirmed, I have asked native speakers of Lithuanian and Belarusian to fulfil a questionnaire.

In the questionnaires I have presented sentences that I have taken from the corpus and modified, in order to get the desired construction. Then, I have asked native speakers to read the sentences and to highlight all the "mistakes", or the unusual things they remark in the text. Moreover, I have asked them to proposed a "correct" variant of the "wrong" constructions (see Appendix).

Apart from this, I have frequently asked native speakers of both languages about the grammaticality or ungrammaticality of given constructions, or about the semantic interpretation they would give to the constructions.

As far as linguistic competence is concerned, I have had no particular problems in finding Lithuanian subjects. All those, whom I have interviewed, deem Lithuanian as their mother tongue and they speak it at home (I have specifically avoided interviewing informants with a Russian- or Polish-speaking familial background).

The Belarusian subjects have represented instead a more complicated issue. The concept of "native speaker" applies only partially to the Belarusian situation. As seen in the previous chapter, many of those, who usually speak Belarusian, have actually learnt it at school, and not at home[42]. Also, it is virtually impossible to find monolingual Belarusians with no competence in Russian, as Russian is dominant in all spheres of the public life (school, television, press, bureaucracy). Therefore, every Belarusian has at least a passive competence in Russian, and s/he is exposed to this language in various situations.

The speakers whom I have interviewed have different competence levels in Belarusian, although they all speak it in their everyday life. Most of my informants have begun to speak Belarusian only in their teen ages, having grown up in Russian-speaking families. Fortunately, I could also

---

[42] In rural centres (but not in all) the situation may be different, as Belarusian is still diffused, spoken at home and in social life. However, I have focussed my analysis on standard language as it is spoken by educated people in urban centres: an analysis of the dialects, and of the *trasjanka*, would have gone beyond the scope of this work.

interview speakers who, on the contrary, come from Belarusian-speaking families and have always spoken Belarusian at home.

Chapter 5. The source schemas and their realization in Belarusian and Lithuanian

In this chapter, the results of the analysis of the Belarusian and Lithuanian data will be presented. The main goal of this analysis is to understand which one of the source schemas is realized in these two languages and what are the possessive notions they can express. In order to achieve this aim, the possible Belarusian and Lithuanian encodings of the Possessor NP, Possessee NP and the predicate for each one of Heine's schemas have been individuated. The resulting possible constructions have been searched in the corpora.

The possible Belarusian and Lithuanian realizations of the syntactic encodings of the Possessor [PR] NP, Possessee [PE] NP and the predicate in each one of the schemas proposed by Heine are listed here below (the Topic and Genitive schemas have been omitted, as they are not realized in European languages):

a. Belarusian

ACTION SCHEMA
PR [Nominative case]; PE [Accusative case]; PRED [*mec'* 'have']
LOCATION SCHEMA
PR: [*u* 'at', *kalja* 'near' + Genitive, *na* 'on', *u* 'in', *pry* 'at' + Locative, *nad* 'over', *pad* 'under', *perad* 'in front of', *za* 'behind' + Instrumental]; PE [Nominative case]; PRED [*byc'* 'be']
GOAL SCHEMA
PR [Dative case]; PE [Nominative case]; PRED [*byc'* 'be']
COMPANION SCHEMA
PR [Nominative case]; PE [*z* 'with', + Instrumental]; PRED [*byc'* 'be']
SOURCE SCHEMA
PR [*ad* 'from' + Gen.); PE [Nominative case]; PRED [*byc'* be']
EQUATION SCHEMA
PR [Genitive case] PE [Nominative case]; PRED [*byc'* 'be']

b. Lithuanian

ACTION SCHEMA

PR [Nominative case]; PE [Accusative case]; PRED [*turėti* 'have']

LOCATION SCHEMA

PR [Locative case, *ant* 'on', *prie*, 'at', *už* 'behind' + Genitive, *pas* 'at', *prieš* 'in front of', + Accusative, *po* 'under', + Instrumental]; PE [Nominative case]; PRED [*būti'* 'be']

GOAL SCHEMA

PR [Dative case]; PE [Nominative case]; PRED [*būti'* 'be']

COMPANION SCHEMA

PR [Nominative case]; PE [*su* 'with', + Instrumental]; PRED [*būti* 'be']

SOURCE SCHEMA

PR [*nuo* 'from', + Gen.]; PE [Nominative case]; PRED [*būti* 'be']

EQUATION SCHEMA

PR [Genitive case]; PE [Nominative case]; PRED [*būti* 'be']

In order to find in the corpus the constructions listed above, the following method has been used.

In the cases where the Possessor is encoded through a prepositional adjunct (that is, in locative, comitative and ablative constructions: for instance, as in ***u** mjane* 'at me'), I searched the desired preposition (for instance, *u* 'at') on the whole corpus. Then, I mixed up the resulting tokens, putting them in random order (so that two contiguous tokens did not come from the same text). Finally, I selected the first two hundred, or two hundred and fifty tokens, and I analysed them.

The same procedure was used to find tokens of *mec'* and *turėti* (as a research base, I have used all the persons and all the possible forms of the verb: infinitive, past, participles, etc.).

In order to find instances of the Goal schema, to the contrary, I searched some general words of different semantic classes, put in the dative case: personal pronouns ('I', 'you', etc.), nouns denoting human beings ('president'), nouns denoting abstract entities ('fatherland') and finally nouns denoting inanimate objects ('house', 'table'). I dedicated particular attention to the class of the relational nouns, such as 'brother' or 'sister': as they usually appear in the nominative case (as they represent the syntactical subject in dative constructions, such as in *ën mne brat* ['he me.DAT. brother'] he is my brother'): therefore, I have searched these words in the nominative case, looking for their being included in a dative construction.

5.1 The Action schema in Belarusian

The Action schema provides Belarusian with one of the two major strategies it disposes for the expression of Possession (the other one is the adessive construction *u* + Gen. (see 5.3)): the verb *mec'*. In the following table, the results of the analysis of 250 occurrences of *mec'* (in all tenses and moods) found in the corpus are shown:

Possessive notion	Tokens
Abstract possession	118
Inanimate possession	87
• Part-whole relations	5
• Abstract Inanimate Possession	84
Ownership	18
Social possession:	17
• Alienable Social Possession	6
• Inalienable Social Possession	11
Inalienable possession	6
Physical Possession	3
Temporary Possession	1
Total	250

Tab. 4 Occurrences of *mec'* in the corpus

Mec' is frequently used in the following expressions, involving an abstract substantive and, usually, an infinitive: *mec' mahčymasc'(rabic' štos'ci)* 'to have the possibility (to do something)', *mec' namer* 'to have the intention (of doing smth.)', *mec' žadanne* 'to have the desire (of doing smth.)', *mec' na ŭvaze* 'to have in mind'. I would not classify them as idiomatic expressions, for they are semantically transparent and each one of the two components retains its original meaning. They should rather be considered as collocations. In most of them *mec'* may be replaced with *u* + Gen.: *u mjane mahčymasc'*/ *maju mahčymasc'*; *u mjane namer* / *maju namer*; *u mjane žadanne* / *maju žadanne*.

Other expressions, conversely, are real idioms: *maju na ŭvaze* 'to have in mind; to mean'; *maju na prykmece* 'to mean'. Here the level of semantic transparency is very low: if *mec'* retains its meaning ('an entity - the Possessee - is related to another entity - the Possessor') the second component does not (*uvaha* usually means 'attention' and *prykmeta* 'sign, omen'). Moreover, no-one of the two components can be replaced with another, and the use of *u* + Gen. is excluded: ***u mjane** na ŭvaze /* ***u mjane** na prykmece*.

In any case, analysing the corpus data, I have excluded from the count both collocations, such as *mec' mahčymasc'*, and idioms, such as *mec' na ŭvaze*: they appear far too frequently in the corpus, representing more than the half of the total tokens. Their inclusion would have meant, thus, to under represent the other possible uses of *mec'*.

5.1.1 Abstract Possession

Mec' may be used with different categories of abstract Possessees:

28. *Ja   kazaŭ   ljudzjam,   što   **ja   maju   maru**   i*
    I.NOM   tell.PST.M.SG   people.DAT.PL COMP I.NOM have.PRS.1SG dream.ACC.SG   and
    *vy   **majce   maru**.*
    you.PL.NOM have.PRS.2PL dream.ACC.SG
    'I have told people that **I have a dream and you have a dream**'

29. *Na pachavanni   pljamennika   **ën   meй   razmovu   z***
    at funeral.LOC.SG   cousin.GEN.SG he.NOM have.PST.M.SG conversation.ACC.SG with
    vidavočcam   trahedyi
    witness.INS.SG tragedy.GEN.SG
    'At his cousin's funeral **he had a conversation** with an eyewitness of the tragedy'

30. *U panjadzelak   **maju   kandydacki   ispyt**   pa filasofii*
    in Monday.ACC   have.PRS.1SG   doctoral.M.ACC.SG   exame.ACC.SG by philosphy.LOC.SG
    'On Monday **I will have the doctoral exam** of philosophy'
    (http://churchby.info/forum/viewtopic.php?p=3877&sid=6ed288d5bbe8aa8d03b9045dd63e315f)

5.1.2 Inanimate Possession

Mec' is decidedly the preferred strategy, among those Belarusian disposes of, for the expression of Inanimate Possession.

(i) Part-whole relations

31. *Budynak*   ***meŭ***   ***admyslovy***   ***pakoj-sejf***   *z*
     Building.NOM.SG have.PST.M.SG special.M.ACC.SG   safe_room.ACC.SG   with
     masiŭnymi   *kratami*   *va vonkach*
     massive.INS.PL   bar.INS.PL   in window.LOC.PL
     'The **building had a special safe room** with massive bars on the windows'

32. *[Artykuly] ananimyja*   *pravakacyjnyja*   *i*   ***majuc'***
     [articles]   anonymous.NOM.PL provocatory.NOM.PL   and   have.PRS.3PL
     adpavednyja   ***zahaloŭki***
     appropriate.ACC.PL title.ACC.PL
     '[The articles] are anonymous, provocative and **have appropriate titles**'

(ii) Inanimate Abstract Possession

33. *Uladzimer Njakljaeŭ*   *rytaryčna*   *zapytaŭsja*   *"čamu kepska havaryc'*
     Uladzimer Njakljaeŭ.NOM rhetorically.ADV ask.PST.M.SG.REFL   why   bad.ADV tell.INF
     praŭdu   *za*   *rasijskija*   *hrošy"*.   ***Belaruskaja***
     truth.ACC.SG   for   Russian.ACC.PL   money.ACC.PL Belarusian.F.NOM.SG
     historyja   ***mae***   ***adkaz***   *na hėtae*   *pytan'ne*
     history.NOM.SG   have.PRS.3SG   answer.ACC.SG in this.N.ACC.SG question.ACC.SG
     'Uladzimer Njakljaeŭ rhetorically asked, why should it be bad to tell the truth, even if it is the
     Russians who pay for this. **The Belarusian history has the answer** to this question'

34. *Naša*   *kraina*   ***ne***   ***mae***   ***kampletku*** *"Našaj Nivy"*
     our.F.NOM.SG   country.NOM.SG   NEG   have.PRS.3SG   set.GEN.SG   Naša Niva.GEN.SG
     'Our country **does not have the complete set** of "Naša Niva"'

5.1.3 Ownership

Mec' is used to express prototypical Possession:

35. *Kožny,*   ***chto***   ***mae***   ***mašynu,***   *vedae,*
     everyone.PRN.M.NOM.SG   who.REL.NOM have.PRS.3SG   car.ACC.SG know.PRS.3SG
     kol'ki   *chvaljavannjaŭ*   *pryčynjajuc'*   *techahljady*
     how_much   worry.GEN.PL   cause.PRS.3PL   overhaul.NOM.PL
     'Everyone, **who has a car,** knows, how many worries overhauls cause'

36. *Kury   ësc'   u kožnaha,   dyj   i   bez   parsjuka   ne*
    hen.NOM.PL be.PRS.3SG at everyone.PRN.M.GEN.SG PART and without pig.GEN.SG NEG

    *abydzeššsja   A   vos'   **karovu   ne ŭse   majuc'***
    manage.PRS.2SG.REFL   But PART cow.ACC.SG not all.PRN.NOM.PL have.PRS.3PL

    'Everyone has hens, and also without a pig you can't manage to go on. But, see, **not everyone has a cow'**

5.1.4 Social Possession

According to Krivickij and Padlužnyj (1994:220ff.) *mec'* cannot be used in Belarusian to express Social Possession. Yet, I have found in the corpus several examples of *mec'* used to express both inalienable (37.) and alienable (38.) social relations. All native speakers have considered such instances as perfectly grammatical:

37. *Cjaper Nasta   pracue   ŭ rekljamnym   biznece   i*
    now   Nasta.NOM work.PRS.3SG in advertising.ADJ.M.LOC.SG   business.LOC.SG   and

    mae   trochhadovaha   syna
    have.PRS.3SG   three-year-old.M.ACC.SG son.ACC.SG

    'Now Nasta works in advertising and **has a three-year-old son'**

38. *Ësc'   ža   jaščě horšyja   za   mjane. […] **Paljuboŭnic   majuc',***
    be.PRS.3SG PART even worse.NOM.PL for I..ACC   lover.ACC.PL   have.PRS.3PL

    i   ne pa   adnoj
    and not by one.F.LOC.SG.

    'There are people even worse than me. […] **They have lovers,** and not just one'

5.1.5 Inalienable Possession

Mec' is not particularly liked in descriptive instances of Inalienable Possession. In the corpus, I haven't found any occurrence of *mec'* in descriptions (such as in sentences like 'he has blue eyes', 'she has long legs', that describe the physical appearance of the subject).

In all the instances of Inalienable Possession found in the corpus and presenting *mec'*, this was rather used to express the existence of a given Possessee in relation with the Possessor (that is, to express a real possessive relation) than to describe some physical characteristics: *toj, chto **mae vočy,** mae ŭse mahčymasci ŭbačyc'* 'he, **who has eyes**, has all the possibilities to see'.

The contraposition between these two kinds of expressions of Inalienable Possession – the ones focussing on the possessive relation (that is asserted and not presupposed) and the others describing

which kind of Possessee the Possessee has (giving the possessive relation as presupposed; Činčlej 1990:79-80) - is indeed crucial in Belarusian.

In the sentence presented in 39., the fact that the "Razumians" (a fictive race of aliens) have trunks, arms and legs is not presented as a presupposed fact (as it would have been in the case of humans, where the existence of legs, arms and trunks is known fact), but it is explicitly asserted:

39. *Ën   uvažliva   azirnuŭ   razumjan.   Jany   **meli***
he.NOM attentively.ADV look.PST.M.SG Razumian.ACC.PL they.NOM   have.PST.PL
doŭhija   cylindryčnyja   tulavy,   tonkija   karotkija   ruki
long.ACC.PL   cylindrical.ACC.PL trunk.ACC.PL thin.ACC.PL short.ACC.PL   arm.ACC.PL
i nohi
and leg.ACC.PL
'He looked attentively at the Razumians. **They had long cylindrical trunks, thin, short arms and legs'**

According to the native speakers, however, *mec'* is more accepted when the characteristic is permanent than in the case it is a temporary one. The sentence in 40. is more acceptable than the one presented in 41.:

40. *Ën   mae   sinija   vočy*
he.NOM have.PRS.3SG blue.ACC.PL eye.ACC.PL
'He **has blue eyes'**

41. *?Ën   mae   čyrvonyja   vočy*
he.NOM have.PRS.3SG red.ACC.PL   eye.ACC.PL
'He **has red eyes** (= because he has cried)'

Similarly, most native speakers have rejected *mec'* in the following example. Here, the element of 'disease' is present too, a circumstance that reinforces the dislike of *mec'*, as this is never used in Belarusian in expressions where the Possessee is a disease (see 6.1.1):

42. *?Halina   mae   chvoryja nohi*
Halina.NOM   have.PRS.3SG ill.ACC.PL leg.ACC.PL
'**Halina's legs** are ill'

In both cases (41. and 42.) native speakers have suggested to replace *mec'* with *u* + Gen.: **u jaho** *čyrvonyja vočy,* **u Haliny** *chvoryja nohi*[43].

It must be said that, as it is often the case in Belarusian, native speakers have expressed different judgements about the acceptability of such expressions. But I could not find any example of the expression 'to have red eyes' with *mec'* even on the Internet, where all the examples I found presented *u* + Gen.. Conversely, I found instance of *mec' sinija vočy* 'to have blue eyes'.

5.1.6 Physical and Temporary Possession

Mec' may be used to express Physical Possession. In this case it is usually accompanied by the locative adjuncts *pry sabe* 'on oneself' and *z saboj* 'with oneself' (43., 44.):

43. *Ja   im   pakazaŭ   pašpart,   use   svae*
    he.NOM they.DAT show.PST.M.SG passport.ACC.SG all.ADJ.ACC.PL own.ACC.PL
    *dokumenty   jakija   **meŭ**   **pry**   **sabe***
    document.ACC.PL which. NOM.PL have.PST.M at PRN.REFL.LOC.SG
    'I showed them my passport and all the documents **I had on me**'

44. *U hètuju   samuju   ŭstanovu   ja   ezdziŭ   try*
    in this.F.ACC.SG same.F.ACC.SG institution.ACC.SG I.NOM go.PST.M three
    *razy   tol'ki   z-za   svaëj   neŭvažlivasci [...]   bo   **ne***
    time.ACC.PL just.ADV because.PREP own.F.GEN.SG carelessness.GEN.SG because NEG
    ***meŭ**   z   **saboj**   nijakaha   kavalka   **paperki**,*
    have.PST.M.SG with PRN.REFL.INS.SG any.ADJ.M.GEN.SG piece.GEN.SG paper.GEN.SG
    ka=b   zanatavac'   čas   pryëmu
    COMP=COND write_down.INF time.ACC.SG appointment.GEN.SG
    'I went to this institution three time, just because of my carelessness […] because **I didn't have any paper with me** to write down the time of the appointment'

Interestingly, *mec'* cannot be employed in the expression 'holding something in one's hand': *ën ***meŭ*** *nešta ŭ ruce* 'he had something in his hand'. Instead, either *u* + Gen. or the verb *trymac'* 'hold' occurr: **u jaho** *bylo nešta u ruce* [lit. 'at him something in the hand'] he had something in his hand' // *ën* ***trymaŭ*** *nešta ŭ ruce* [lit. 'he held something in hand'] 'he held something in his hand'. *Mec'* is also not used in expressions like English *to have something on oneself* ('to wear'): *ën ***meŭ*** *nešta*

---

[43] The sentence *u Haliny chvoryja nohi* i san actual sentence from the corpus, that I have modified into the example reported in 42. in the questionnaire (see Appendix).

na sabe 'he had something on'[44]. In this case Belarusian prefers a locative construction: **na im** *byŭ spartovy kascjum* 'he had a sportswear on' [lit. '**on him** was a sportswear']. Similarly, Belarusian does not use *mec'* in expressions of like **maju tvaju knigu doma* 'I have your book at my place'. Instead, a locative sentence would be used: *tvaja kniga ŭ mjane doma* [lit. 'your book (is) at me at home'] 'id.', where *u mjane doma* ['at me at home'] should be understood as a locative adjunctive and not as a possessive construction.

Yet, *mec'* occurrs in expressions like the one in 45.:

45. *Chlopec*   **meŭ**   **kalja sjabe**   *hazetu*
     boy.NOM.SG   have.PST.M.SG   near   PRN.REFL.GEN.SG   newspaper.ACC.SG
     'the boy **had** a newspaper **near to him'**

In pragmatic and syntactic terms, this sentence represents the converse of 46.:

46. *Hazeta*   *byla*   *kalja chlopca*
     newspaper.NOM.SG   be.PST.F.SG   near   boy.GEN.SG
     'The newspaper was near to the boy'

These two sentences are specular converses. First, the pragmatic roles are reversed: the constituent that is in topical position in 45. appears in focus position in 46., and vice versa. Then, the syntactic encodings are reversed too: the constituent encoded as a locative adjunct in 46. is encoded as a nominative subject in 45. The sentence in 45. has a iconical structure. It localises an entity ('the newspaper') with reference to another entity ('the boy'), which happens to be therefore a reference-point. The reference-point is more relevant, in cognitive terms, than the localised entity (as the world is organised with reference to the former): this disparity in relevance is iconically shown by encoding the reference-point as the subject in topical position, whereas the target, the localised object, is represented as an object. The original locational meaning of the sentence is preserved in the prepositional phrase involving the reflexive pronoun (*kalja sjabe* 'next to himself'): the original location, even if encoded as a nominative agent, still retains something of the ancient role in the pronominal duplication.

Usually, in locative expression both the reference-point and the localised object are inanimate ('the book is under the table'; 'there is a book under the table'). In this case, conversely, the reference-point is a human being: this makes the use of *mec'* even more suitable. The surface structure of 45., in fact, has the canonical structure of agentive nominative expressions, where the agent (who exerts

---

[44] Polish, conversely, accepts them: *on miał na sobie sweter* 'he had a sweater on'.

control over the object) is given the nominative encoding and patient is encoded as an accusative. Evidently, here there is no real agentivity, and control is completely missing (the boy does not even possesses the newspaper – or at least this is unknown to us): the subject has the mere function of a localisator. Nevertheless, the apparently agentive structure fulfils the tendency of human beings to be encoded as subjects rather than as locations or as objects (as it would be the case in 46., where the human participant is encoded as a locative adjunct). Consequently, *mec',* here, has a mere structural function: it helps in reversing the syntactic and pragmatic roles of the constituent, establishing a relation between a reference-point and an entity that can be found in its domain. In cognitive terms, this is also the basic structure of possessive expressions (see 1.1, 1.2): the difference is that, in this case, the subject's "sphere of existence", or "sphere of control" must be understood as concrete ("the space next to the boy") and not metaphorically.

It could be argued, that the same analysis fits to the expressions presented in 44. and 43.: that is, that in these expressions *mec'* has a mere structural function too - that of reversing the roles of the original sentences, encoding the most relevant participant as the grammatical subject, and not a location: 'I have shown them all the documents that were on me' → 'the documents I had on me' and 'because there was no piece of paper with me' → 'because I had no piece of paper with me'.

However, it seems to me that here a slight hint of control may be found. In 44. the subject complains the lack of a piece of paper, for he was evidently intending to use it. This expression, thus, must be considered as being nearer to the semantic domain of Possession than the one represented in 45. It must also be considered that constructions involving *z* 'with' can be used to express Possession even without *mec'* or *u* + Gen. (see further): in which case we would be dealing with an instance of the Companion schema. It seems that two schemas are combined in 44..: the Companion schema (*z*) and the Action schema (*mec'*).

The sentence in 43. is also an instance of Physical Possession (therefore, it is actually an instance of Location, but a certain possessive flavour), and not of mere Location. The reason for considering it as an instance of Physical Possession is based on the fact that 'having something on oneself' implies a more intimate relation and a certain control, more than the fact of 'having something next to oneself' – where the subject merely serves as localising reference-point.

Among the analysed tokens from the corpus I have found only one example of possible Temporary Possession:

47. *Dėmanstranty*   **meli**   ***nastupnyja***   ***ras'cjažki***:   *"Malady front"[..]*
demonstrator.NOM.PL have.PST.PL   following.ACC.PL banners.ACC.PL: *"Malady front"*
'The demonstrators **had the following banners**: "*Malady Front*" […]"'

Yet I am not sure about the interpretation of this example. It can be interpreted as "the demonstrants were using banners (and we do not know, whose the banners were)". In this case this would be a case of Temporary Possession: the demonstrants are temporarily in possession of some banners, that they are using. But it could also be considered as an instance of Physical Possession: 'they had banners' = 'they held banners in their hands'. This interpretation seems to me the most adherent to the real meaning of the sentence.

In the questionnaires I have presented to native speakers, there was the following sentence (see Appendix, 14.):

48. - *Anja, ci vedaeš,   dze   kniha,   jakuju   my   kupili*
Anja Q know.PRS.2SG where   book.NOM.SG which..ACC.SG we.NOM buy.PST.PL
ŭ Italii,   pamjataeš,   pra   staražytny   Rym?   Ne
in Italy.LOC.SG   remember.PRS.2SG   about ancient.ACC.SG Rome.ACC.SG NEG
mahu   jae   nidze   znajsci... - Tak, vedaju,   *jae
can.PRS.1SG she.ACC   nowhere   find.INF   Yes know.PRS.1SG she.ACC
mae   Paval.
have.PRS.3SG   Paul.NOM.SG
'Anja, do you know where is the book that we had bought in Italy, you know, about ancient Rome? I can't find it. - Yes, I know, **Paul has it**.'

I could recollect only three answers to this question, and they all were negative: In this context *mec'* would not be used. Instead *u* + Gen. is preferred: *kniha ŭ Paŭla*.

It seems, therefore, that *mec'* is employed in Belarusian to express Physical, but not Temporary Possession[45]. However, it is not very easy to find a definitive answer to this question. As already stated, it is very difficult to find instances of Temporary Possession in a corpus: the temporarity of an expression can be usually desumed only from the whole textual context. An "artificial" context, as the one presented above, is, of course, significative, but it does not represent all the possible situations, in which a meaning of Temporary Possession can be found.

---

[45] Interestingly, one of my informants had given the following explanation to the refusal of *mec'* in the sentence presented above: "the expression *jae mae Paval* 'Paul has it' would mean, that the book belongs to Paval, which does not apply to the situation described in the dialogue". His judgement confirms the role of *mec'* as a verb, whose primary meaning is to express real Possession (ownership).

5.1.7 *Trymac'*

Maroz (2001) includes in her list of Belarusian possessive verbs also *trymac', '*hold':

49. *Ën [...]*   ***trymaŭ***   *u nedalëkaj*   *vësci*   ***kramu***
     he.NOM   hold.PST.M.SG   in near.F.LOC.SG   village.LOC.SG shop.ACC.SG
     'He [...] **kept a shop** in the village nearby'
     (Maroz 2001:77)

In the corpus some similar examples have been found too:

50. *Lukašenka*   *pryznaŭsja,*   *što*   *ŭ vol'ny*   *čas [...]*
     Lukašenka.NOM   admit.PST.M.SG.REFL COMP   in free.M.ACC.SG   time.ACC.SG
     sam   *vjadze*   *asabistuju*   *haspadarku*   *[i]*   ***što***
     himself.NOM.SG   manage.PRS.3SG   personal.F.ACC.SG farm.ACC.SG   [and]   COMP
     trymae   ***karovu***
     hold.PRS.3SG   cow.ACC.SG
     'Lukašenka admitted that in his free time he personally manages his own farm and that **he keeps a cow'**

Even if the examples quoted above could give, on a first glance, the impression that *trymac'* is actually a possessive verb, I consider this hypothesis incorrect. *Trymac*', in fact, does not just mean 'have', but it implies a broader semantic sphere, the one of 'keeping, leading, managing (a farm, a shop, a cow)'. Evidently, the fact of 'managing a shop' or 'keeping a cow' implies a certain possessive relation between the shopkeeper and the shop, the farmer and the cow, but the meaning of *trymac'* goes beyond the pure affirmation of this possessive relation. Similarly, the act of 'holding in the hand' does not imply abstract control, and thus Possession, but just physical control. Therefore, I do not consider *trymac'* as a possessive verb, though it covers – in both its meanings of 'holding (in one's hand)' and 'keeping, leading, managing' - a semantic space that intersects with the domain of Possession (a part of this space is the notion of Physical Possession).

5.2 The Action schema in Lithuanian

The Action schema is represented in Lithuanian by the verb *turėti* 'have', the major strategy Lithuanian uses to express Possession.
In the following table, the results of the analysis of 250 occurrences of *turėti* (in all tenses and moods) found in the corpus are showed.

Possessive notion	Tokens	%
Abstract possession	124	49.6
Inanimate possession	51	20.4
• Part-whole relations	6	
• Inanimate Abstract Possession	45	
Ownership	37	14.4
Social possession	27	10.8
• Inalienable Social Possession	12	
• Alienable Social Possession	15	
Temporary possession	1	
Physical Possession	5	2.8
Inalienable possession	5	2
Total	250	100

Tab.5 Occurrences of *turėti* in the corpus

Just like *mec'*, *turėti* may also be used in a range of collocations and idioms, frequently the same as in Belarusian: *turėti galimybę* 'to have the possibility (of)', *turėti norą* 'to have the desire (of)', *turėti omenyje* 'to mean'[46]. The similar phraseology in the two languages can be explained through the influence of Russian, where exactly the same collocations and idioms are found: *imet' možnost'* 'to have the possibility', *imet' želanie* 'to have the desire', *imet' v vidu* 'to have in mind; to mean' (lit. 'to have in view').

As in the case of *mec'*, such expressions have been excluded from the analysis.

5.2.1 Abstract Possession

Turėti is very frequently used with abstract Possessees:

51. *Su   buvusia   savo   kaimyne   turėjau*
    with former.F.INS.SG PRN.REFL.GEN neighbour.INS.SG have.PST.1SG

    įdomų   pokalbį
    interesting.M.ACC.SG conversation.ACC.SG

    'I **had an interesting** conversation with my former neighbour'

---

[46] The idiomatic expression *turėti omenyje* is used to express the meaning of 'mean', even as an expletive. It may also be used in a collocation meaning 'to keep in mind' (also *laikyti omenyje,* lit. 'to keep in mind') – in this case, the original meaning of *omenis* 'mind, memory' is respected.

52. *Iki Homero   Hermis   buvo   tarpininkas   tarp*
    until Homer.GEN   Hermes.NOM   be.PST.3   intermediary.NOM.SG   between

    *gamtos   ir žmonių […]   **turėjo   labai   didelę***
    nature.GEN.SG and people.GEN.PL   have.PST.3   very.ADV   big.F.ACC.SG

    galią
    power.ACC.SG

    'Until Homer Hermes was an intermediary between the nature and the people […] **He had a very   great power'**

53. *Rusijoje   **balso   teisę   turi   110 mln.   piliečių***
    Russia.LOC.SG vote**.**GEN.SG   right.ACC.SG   have.PRS.3   110 million citizen.GEN.PL

    'In Russia 110 million citizens **have the right to vote'**

5.2.2 Inanimate Possession

Turėti may be used to express all types of Inanimate Possession, both part-whole relations as well as abstract relations:

(i) Part-whole relations

54. *Petravičių   namas   **turi   5 kambarius,   priemenę   ir***
    Petravičiai.GEN.PL house.NOM.SG have.PRS.3 5 room.ACC.PL   hallway.ACC.SG   and

    virtuvę
    kitchen. ACC.SG

    'The house of the Petravičiai has five rooms, a hallway and a kitchen'

(ii) Inanimate Abstract Possession

55. *Kaunas   **turi   savų   ypatumų***
    Kaunas.NOM   has.PRS.3   ADJ.REFL.GEN.PL   particularity.GEN.PL

    'Kaunas **has its own particularities**'

56. *Kiek   žinau,   **žodis   "baras"   Liūto   Mockūno***
    how_much   know.PRS.1SG word.NOM.SG   'baras.NOM.SG'   Liūtas.GEN   Mockūnas.GEN

    *žodyne   **turi   kiek   platesnę   prasmę   nei***
    dictionary.LOC.SG have.PRS.3   how_much   broader.F.ACC.SG meaning.ACC.SG   than

    įprasta?
    usually.ADV

    'As far as I know, in Liūtas Mockūnas' dictionary **the word 'baras' has a far broader meaning** than usually, doesn't it?'

Interestingly, in Lithuanian *turėti* can be used to express the relations Heine labelled as 'Inanimate alienable Possession', and which I have excluded from the analysis, as they are, actually, instances of Location, and not of Possession (1.6.1):

57. *Tas*   *Mir26*   *ką*   *tiksliai*   **turi**   **parašyta**
this.M.NOM.SG   Mir26 what..REL.ACC actually.ADV   have.PRS.3   written.PPP.N.NOM.SG
ant   ***savęs****:   Мир- 26Б, Мир-26В, o   gal   parašyta   lotyniškom*
on   PRN.REFL.GEN Мир-26Б, Мир-26В   and maybe written.PPP.N.NOM.SG   Latin.F.INS.PL
raidėm?
letter.INS.PL
'This Mir26 [a bayonet model], what **is actually written on it**: Мир-26Б, Мир-26В, or is it maybe written in Latin characters?'
(http://fotokudra.lt/forumas/viewtopic.php?p=69738)

Conversely, in Belarusian *mec'* is not available in this meaning: Instead, a locative construction would be used: *što **na im** napisana*? 'what is written on it'? The same construction, however, may be used in Lithuanian as well:

58. *Esu*   *tikras,*   *kad*   ***ant tavo***   ***telefono***
be.PRS.1SG   sure.M.NOM.SG   COMP   on   you.SG.GEN   telephone.GEN.SG
parašyta   *"Made in South Korea"*
written.PPP.N.NOM.SG   Made in South Korea
'I am sure that **on your telephone it is written** 'Made in South Korea'
(http://www.mobili.lt/lt/pasaulio_naujienos/samsung_pristate_galaxy_tab_2.htm)

5.2.3 Ownership

As already in the case of *mec'*, for *turėti* the expression of ownership represents the main function as well:

59. *Stanislavos*   *Žukauskaitės*   *tėvas*   *šiame*   *kaime*
Stanislava.GEN   Žukauskaitė.GEN father.NOM.SG this.M.LOC.SG village.LOC.SG
turėjo   ***stambų***   ***ūkį***
have.PST.3   big.M.ACC.SG   farm.ACC.SG
'Stanislava Žukauskaitė's father **had a large-scale farm** in this village'

60. *Jauni*   *pensiono*   *žmonės*   *labiausiai*   *nori*   *gyventi*
young.M.NOM.PL guesthouse.GEN.SG   people.NOM.PL mostly.ADV   want.PRS.3   live.INF

94

savarankiškai,	***turėti***	***savus***	***namus***
independently.ADV	have.INF	ADJ.REFL.ACC.PL	house.ACC.PL

'What the young people in the guesthouse mostly want is to live by themselves, they want **to have their own houses**'

5.2.4 Social Possession

Turėti may express all types of Social relations, both inalienable (61.) and inalienable (62.):

61.
Aš	***turiu***	*tik*	***vieną***	***žmoną,***	*mano*	*tėvas*	*turėjo*
I.NOM	have.PRS.1SG	only	one.ACC.SG	wife.ACC.SG	I.GEN	father.NOM.SG	have.PST.3

tris.	***Turiu***	***keturis***	***vaikus.***
three.ACC.PL	have.PRS.1SG	four.ACC.PL	child.ACC.PL

'I have only one wife, my father had three. **I have four children**'

62.
Italijos	*policija*	*mafijos*	*gretose*	***turi***	***1200 informatorių***
Italy.GEN	police.NOM.SG	mafia.GEN.SG	rank.LOC.PL	have.PRS.3	1200 informers.ACC.PL

'The Italian police **has 1200 informers** in the ranks of the mafia'

5.2.5 Physical and Temporary Possession

Just like *mec'*, *turėti* may be used to express Physical Possession. Unlike *mec'*, *turėti* may be used in the expression 'to hold something in the hand' too: *vaikas [sulaikytas]* ***turėdams pinigą rankoje,*** 'the boy [was caught] having the money in his hand'. Yet, this is the only example of Physical Possession I have found among the analysed occurrences.

The following example, containing the comitative adjunct *su savimi* 'with oneself', can be considered as an instance of Physical, as well as of Temporary Possession, yet I am inclined to consider it as an instance of Physical Possession: the woman had the handbag with her at the moment, when she disappeared. The sentence could yet also be interpreted as referring to a longer period of time, in which case we would be dealing with Temporary Possession. It can be considered as an instance of the Action schema (because of *turėti*), mixed with the Companion schema (because of *su* 'with'):

63.
Kauno	*rajono*	*PK*	*ieško*	*dingusios*	*be*
Kaunas.GEN	region.GEN.SG	PK	look_for.PRS.3	disapperead.PaPA.F.GEN.SG	without

žinios	*pilietės*	*Ritos*	*Čeilitkaitės […]*	***Su savimi***	
notice.GEN.SG	citizen.GEN.SG	Rita.NOM	Čeilitkaitė.NOM	with	PRN.REFL.INS

turėjo	*nedidelį*	*rankinuką*
have.PST.3	little.M.ACC.SG	handbag.ACC.SG

'The Kaunas police is looking for the citizen Rita Čeilitkaitė, who has disappeared without giving notice […] **She had a little handbag with her'**

In 64. the meaning is clearly of Temporary Possession: 'we had the bulldozer-excavator and we used it' (but it maybe belonged to someone else than the speakers):

64.
Spalio 7-ą		*keliasdešimt*		*vyrų […],*	*dešimtys moterų*		*ir*
October.GEN 7-th.ACC.SG		some_dozens.NUM		man.GEN.PL	ten.	woman.GEN.PL	and

vaikų	*ėmėsi*		*kasinėjimo.*	***Turėjome***			*,*
child.GEN.PL	take_on.PST.REFL.3		excaving.GEN.SG	have.PST.1PL		bulldozer-	

buldozerį-ekskavatorių	excavator.ACC.SG

tačiau daugiausia	*teko*		*darbuotis*	*kastuvais,*		*kastuvėliais,*	*žarstyti*
but mostly.ADV	have_to.PST.3		work.INF.REFL	shovel.INS.PL		trowel.INS.PL	rake.INF

rankomis
hand.INS.PL

'On the 7th October dozens of men […] ten women and children began to dig […] We **had a bulldozer-excavator**, but mostly we had to work with shovels and trowels and we had to rake t he soil with our hands'

In Lithuanian, just like in Belarusian, *turėti* can be used in locative expressions like 'the boy had the newspaper next to him' (see above, 5.1.6):

65.
Nepaprastai,	*neapsakomai*	*norėjau*	*kūdikį*	***turėti***	***šalia***
extremely.ADV	indescribably.ADV	want.PST.1SG	baby.ACC.SG	have.INF	near

savęs,	*bet jį*	*nunešdavo...*
PRN.REFL.GEN	but he.ACC	take_away.ITER.PST.3

'I extremely, indescribably wanted to have my baby next to me, but they always took him away...'

Činčlej (1990:56) states, that in Lithuanian expressions of Temporary Possession like *Knygą turi Jonas* 'John has the book' (= 'the book is at John's place (and John presumably uses it)') are accepted[47]. To the contrary, they are not accepted in Belarusian (see above, 5.1.6).

5.2.6 Inalienable Possession

The corpus analysis has showed that *turėti* is not the preferred strategy for the expression of Inalienable Possession in the case of physical descriptions. The judgements of the native speakers have confirmed this result as well (see also Činčlej 1990:98ff.). When asked about the grammaticality of the following example, most informants have rejected it:

66. *?Ji   turėjo   tamsus,   banguotus   plaukus   ir*
    she.NOM have.PST.3 dark.M.ACC.PL,   wavy.M.ACC.PL   hair.ACC.PL   and

    mėlynas   akis
    blue.ACC.PL   eye.ACC.PL

    'She had dark wavy hair and blue eyes'

Native speakers have proposed instead to substitute *turėti* with either an adnominal genitive (***jos plaukai*** *buvo tamsūs* 'her hair was dark') or a topicalised genitive (***jos*** *buvo tamsūs plaukai* [lit. 'she.GEN was dark hair'] 'she had a dark hair', see below, 5.12.1)[48].

In the corpus, some examples have been found where *turėti* is associated to the description of physical characteristics, such as 'blue eyes' or 'brown hair': in most cases, however, the predicate appears in a non-finite form (participles and infinitives), as in 67. and 68. Probably, thus, the use of *turėti* in such expressions is not semantically but rather syntactically motivated: *turėti* is employed as a suppletive lexeme for *būti* 'be' when a non-finite verbal form is required[49]:

67. *Kino   žvaigždė, kurios   **žavias**   **akis***
    cinema.GEN.SG   star.NOM.SG which.REL.F.GEN.SG green.F.ACC.PL   eye.ACC.PL

    norėtų   ***turėti*** *daugelis   moterų*
    want.COND.3   have.INF many.NOM.SG   woman.GEN.PL

    'A star of the cinema, whose **green eyes** most women would like **to have**'

---

[47] However, we might also be dealing with an instance of Location here ('the book is at John's place'). The exact meaning of the sentence can be desumed only from the context as it is in many other cases.

[48] A further construction, with a bare Instrumental or with a comitative construction may be used: *ji buvo (su) tamsiasis plaukais* she was (with) dark hair 'id.'.Comitative constructions will be discussed below (5.7,5.8). Constructions with a bare Instrumental should not be considered as possessive, but rather as copular sentences, where *garbanuotais plaukais* 'wavy hair.INS' should be considered as an attributive constituent. The same is valid for expressions, where a bare genitive is used (the so-called "genitive of quality"): *ji buvo mėlynių akinių* 'she was of blue eyes'.

[49] This suppletive function is typical for Russian *imet'* too (Guiraud-Weber and Mikaeljan:2004).

68. *Tokie   ūsiukai   ir   barzdelė   tinka   vaikinams,*
    such.NOM.PL   moustache.NOM.PL and beard.NOM.SG   fit.PRS.3   boy.DAT.PL

    turintiems   ilgus   garbanotus   plaukus
    have.PPA.M.DAT.PL   long.M.ACC.PL choppy.MACC.PL   hair.ACC.PL

    'Clipped moustaches and short beards are fit for boys who **have long choppy hair'**

The same may be said of Belarusian *mec'* too: *mne hacelasja b **mec' takia sinija vočy*** 'I would like **to have** such blue eyes' is a well-formed and well-accepted Belarusian sentence. In both languages, 'have' verbs are used when non-finite verbal forms are required (in Belarusian, though, contrarily from Lithuanian, the use of participles is very restricted).

I have found in the corpus a couple of examples with finite forms of *turėti* too. In 69. the use of a 'have' strategy could be motivated by the fact that 'the hair' has been successively cut. It could be, therefore, that, in this example, the 'hair' is not seen as an inalienable characteristic of the subject, but rather as an alienable entity, an object that may be thrown away:

69. *Kažkada   **turėjau   ilgus   plaukus**, -   sakė   Rožė   Marija,-   o*
    formerly.ADV have.PST.1SG   long.M.ACC.PL hair.ACC.PL say.PST.3 Rožė Marija.NOM but

    dabar pamėgau   trumpą   šukuoseną
    now   like.PST.1SG short.ACC.SG   haircut.ACC.PL

    'Formerly **I had long hair**, - said Rožė Marija, - but now I have become fond of short haircuts'

Interestingly, the dislike of *turėti* in physical descriptions seems to be true in the case of inanimate Possessors too. The following example is quite unusual in Lithuanian[50]:

70. *?Mūsų   namas   turi   raudoną   stogą*
    we.GEN   house.NOM.SG have.PRS.3 red.ACC.SG roof.ACC.SG

    'Our house has a red roof'

Instead, native speakers have proposed variants with either a 'topicalised genitive' (***mūsų namo** yra raudonas stogas*) or an Instrumental/comitative construction (*mūsų namas yra **(su) raudonu stogu***), that are used in human physical descriptions as well (see further). Here, the only reason of disliking *turėti* is because of the adjective 'red', which, qualifying the object, transforms the sentence into a description. Usually, in fact, *turėti* is most liked in expressions of inanimate Possession, and

---

[50] While fulfilling the questionnaire (see Appendix, ex.35), a native speaker had proposed the sentence *Mūsų namas turi raudoną stogą* as a correct variant, but then cancelled it, preferring instead a construction with the Instrumental case (*namas yra raudonu stogu* 'the house is (with) red roof'). However, two informants have judged the variant with turėti acceptable.

particularly in those including inclusion: *namai turi stogą ir langus* 'houses have a roof and windows'.

Turėti, conversely, is liked in expressions where the assertion of the possessive relation is in focus, showing therefore the same pattern as Belarusian *mec'*: *jis **turi akis**, pats pamatys* 'he has eyes, he will see'. This point will be tackled more in detail further (see ch.6).

5.3 The Location schema in Belarusian

In Belarusian only the spatial prepositions *u* 'at', *pry* 'by' and *za* 'behind' may be used to express Possession.

5.3.1 Constructions with no possessive functions

The following constructions have never been attributed in the scientific literature (Zolotova 1988[51]; Šuba 1993) a possessive meaning:

kalja + Gen. 'near'; *na* + Loc. 'on'; *nad* + Instr. 'over', *pad* + Instr. 'under', *perad* + Instr. 'in front of'

The corpus analysis has confirmed this judgment. Around 150 occurrences of each construction have been analyzed, but none of them has resulted in being used to express possessive relations.

5.3.2 *U* + Gen.

U + Gen.[52] represents one of the two major possessive constructions Belarusian disposes of. Apart from its possessive function, *u* + Gen. still retains its locative meaning of 'at one's place': *ja ŭ Jana* 'I am at Jan's place'[53]. It may also fulfil some other functions, as to encode Experiencers (71., 72.)[54]:

> 71. *Moža pašancuje   Alency?   Jak **u   mjane**   z   Jankam..*
>   maybe have_luck.PRS.3SG Alenka.DAT As at I.GEN   with Janka.INS
>   'Maybe, Alenka will have luck? As **I have had luck** with Janka…'

---

[51] Zolotova writes about Russian, but her analyis, to some extent, applies to Belarusian as well.

[52] The specification of the case is necessary: in fact, *u* may also be follwed by the Locative case, in which case, it does not denote an adessive, but an inessive relation: *u chace.*'house'.LOC 'in the house'. *U* + Loc. have no possessive functions. Actually, these two propositions have phonetically merged in Belarusian, but they derive from two different Common Slavic propositions, **u* 'at' and **vъ* 'in'. Compare Russian *u* 'at, by' and *v* 'in'; in Ukrainian **u* and ** vъ* have merged into *v* 'at; in'.

[53] Unlike in Russian, Belarusian *u* + Gen. cannot be used to express proximity, and *kalja* is used instead: Rus. *Stol **u** okna* 'the table is near to the window', Bel. *stol **kalja (lja)** vokna* 'id.'.

[54] See Weiss (1999) for a survey of the uses of Russian *u* + Gen., most of which apply to Belarusian too.

72. ***U jae***   *naradzilasja*   *dačka*

    at she.GEN   be_born.PST.F.SG   daughter.NOM.SG

    'She has given birth to a daughter [lit. '**at her** a daughter was born']'

The corpus analysis has showed that the possessive meaning is the most common one: out of 260 analyzed occurrences of *u* + Gen. 199 were possessive.

In the following table, the results of the analysis of these occurrences of possessive *u* + Gen. are presented:

Possessive notion	Tokens
a. Abstract possession	120
b. Social Possession:	24
• Social Inalienable Possession	11
• Social Alienable Possession	13
c. Ownership	22
d. Inanimate possession:	13
• Part-whole relations	0
• Inanimate Abstract Possession	13
e. Inalienable possession	10
f. Temporary possession	7
g.Physical Possession	3
Total	199

Tab.6 Occurrences of *u* + Gen. in the corpus

As already said for *mec'* and *turėti*, analysing the corpus data I have not taken into account collocations such as *u mjane (ёsc') mahčymasc'* 'I have the possibility (of)', *u mjane (ёsc') žadanne* 'I have the desire (of)'.

5.3.2.1 Abstract possession

U + Gen. may express Abstract Possession, as in the following examples:

73.   *Hleb*   *sapraŭdy*   *ŭsё*   *pomniŭ:*   ***u Aleha***   ***byla***

     Hleb.NOM.SG   really.ADV   all.PRN.N.ACC.SG remember.PST.M.SG   at   Aleh.GEN be.PST.F.SG

ŭ junactve   **mjanuška**   *Hus'*

in youth.LOC.SG   nickname.NOM.SG Hus'

'Hleb remembered everything: in his young days **Aleh had the nickname** *Goose*

74. *Večna adno*   *i   toe*   *ž:*   **u adnaho** –   **neacennyja**

always one.N.NOM.SG   and   same.N.NOM.SG   PART at one.PRN.GEN.SG priceless.NOM

zasluhi   *perad narodam,*   *u druhoha*   *mahutnyja*

service.NOM.PL   before people.INS.SG at other.M.GEN.SG   powerful.NOM.PL

zastupniki

 patron.NOM.PL

'It is always the same thing: **one has priceless services** to his people, the other has powerful patrons'

5.3.2.2 Social Possession

U + Gen. may be used to express both Social Inalienable (75..) and Social Alienable Possession (76.):

75. **U mjane ž   dačka**,   *u mjane ž   njama   syna,   njama*

at I.GEN PART daughter.NOM.SG at I.GEN PART NEG.be.PRS.3   son.GEN.SG NEG.be.PRS

pracjahu…

continuation.GEN.SG

'But I have a daughter, I do not have a son, I haven't a continuation…'

76. **U litoŭcaŭ** –   **Mamantavas,**   **u rasejcaŭ** –   **Barzoŭ,**   *a   ŭ nas*

at Lithuanian.GEN.PL Mamantavas.NOM at Russian.GEN.PL Borzov.NOM   and   at we.GEN

*njachaj budze   **Vitalik Artyst***

PART   be.FUT.3SG Vitalik Artyst.NOM.

'Lithuanians have Mamantavas, Russians have Borzov, and let us have Vitalik Artyst'

5.3.2.3 Ownership

The possibility of expressing ownership gives *u* + Gen.. a prominent status among the constructions used for the expression of possession in Belarusian:

77. **Kury   ësc'   u kožnaha,**   *dyj   i   bez   parsjuka   ne*

hen.NOM.SG be.PRS.3SG at everyone.M.GEN.SG   PART and   without pig.GEN.SG   NEG

abydzeššja.   A   vos' karovu   ne ŭse   majuc'

manage.PRS.REFL.2PL   but PART cow.ACC.SG not all.PRN.NOM.PL have.PRS.3PL

'**Everyone has hens**, and without a pig you can't manage to go on. But, see, not everyone has a cow'

78. *My   amal'   zemljaki, -   usmichnuŭsja   Vajdaš. –   **U mjane   ŭ***

we.NOM almost countryman.NOM.PL smile.PST.M.SG.REFL Vajdaš.NOM.SG.   At I.GEN   in

*Mensku **kvatèra***

Minsk.LOC apartment.NOM.SG

'We are almost countrymen, - smiled Vajdaš.- **I have an apartment** in Minsk…'

5.3.2.4. Inanimate Possession

U + Gen. can express Inanimate Possession, but, particularly in the case of part-whole relations, it is disliked vis-à-vis *mec'*.

(i) Part-whole relations

Among the analyzed instanced of *u* + Gen., I have not found any instance of predicative internal Possession where *u* + Gen. was used to express an inanimate part-whole relation. I have found yet an example, where *u* + Gen expresses a part-whole relation indeed, but it is used in a ambiguous position (semi-predicative, see further, 5.12.3):

79. *[Jana]   vykapala   try   kusty,   bol'š   ne   zmahla: **u***

[she.NOM] dig_out.PST.F.SG three.ACC.PL bush.ACC.PL   more.ADV NEG can.PST.F.SG at

adnaho   koran'   byŭ   taŭščynëj   z   mužčynskuju

one.M.GEN.SG root.NOM.SG be.PST.M.SG   thickness.INS.SG from man's.ADJ.F.ACC.SG

ruku   – na 20 santymetraŭ

hand.ACC.SG   on 20 centimetre.GEN.PL

'She dug out three bushes, she could't more: **one of them had a root** as thick as a man's hand –

more or less twenty centimeters'

U + Gen. is particularly disliked to express part-whole relations*,* in particular when they involve inclusion ('the house has five rooms'). In the corpus, I have not found any example of *u* + Gen. used with this meaning. Instead, *mec'* would be preferably used.

The sentence presented in 80a. is theoretically acceptable, but some native speakers have disliked it (see Appendix, ex.20), and they have proposed instead to use either a locative construction (80b.) or *mec'* (80c.):

80. a. ***U muzeja   byŭ   admyslovy   pakoj-sejf***

at museum.GEN.SG   be.PST.M.SG   special.M.NOM.SG safe_room.NOM.SG

'**The building had** a special safe-room'

b. ***U muzei   byŭ   admyslovy   pakoj-sejf***

in museum.LOC.SG   be.PST.M.SG special..M.NOM.SG   safe-room.NOM.SG

'**In the museum there was** a special safe-room'

    c.   *Muzej*   **meŭ**   *admyslovy*   *pakoj-sejf*

        Museum.NOM.SG have.PST.M.SG special..M.ACC.SG   safe_room.ACC.SG

        'The museum **had** a special safe room'

(ii) Inanimate abstract possession

In the case of abstract Inanimate Possession, on the contrary, *u* + Gen. does not present particular restrictions:

    81.   **U Minskaha**   **zaaparku –**   **vjalikija**   **plany**.   *U pryvatnasci,*

        at Minsk.ADJ.GEN.SG zoo.GEN.SG   great.NOM.PL plane.NOM.PL in particular.LOC.SG

        pavinny   *z''javicca*   *novyja*   *ekspazicyi:*   *akvariumy,*

        obliged.NOM.PL   appear.INF.REFL new.NOM.PL   exhibition.NOM.PL acquarium.NOM.PL

        tėrariumy

        terrarium.NOM.PL

        '**The Zoo of Minsk has big planes**.In particular, some new exhibitions will be opened: aquariums, terrariums'

    82.   *U 70-ja*   *hady*   *minulaha*   *stahodz'dzja*   *žartavali –*   *zamest*

        in 70-ACC.PL year.ACC.PL past.M.GEN.SG century.GEN.SG joke.PST.PL instead

        kamunizmu   *ŭ SSSR* *budze*   *Alimpijada.*   **U hėtaha**

        communism.GEN.SG in URSS be.FUT.3SG Olympic_Games.NOM.SG At this.M.GEN.SG

        žartu   *byŭ*   *sur'ëzny*   *tėaretyčny*   *hrunt*

        joke.GEN.SG be.PST.M.SG   serious.M.NOM.SG theoretical.M.NOM.SG basis.NOM.SG

        'In the 1970s people used to repeat a popular joke: "in the USSR, instead of communism, there will be the Olympic games". This joke **had a serious theoretical basis'**

5.3.2.5 Inalienable Possession

U + Gen. is decidedly the preferred option for the expression of Inalienable Possession in Belarusian. It can be used to express physical descriptions (83..), but also in expressions, where the possessive relation is asserted and not presupposed (84.).

    83.   **U bac'ki**   **byli**   **sinija**   **vočy**.   *Ne* *blakitnyja,*   *ne*

        at father.GEN.SG be.PST.PL blue.NOM.PL eye.NOM.PL not light-blue.NOM.PL not

        valoškavyja,   *a sinija*

        cornflower-blue.NOM.PL but blue.NOM.PL

        'My father had blue eyes. Not light-blue, not cornflower-blue, but blue!'

84. | ***U kaho*** | ***ësc'*** | ***vočy*** | *–* | *toj* | *bačyc'* |
    at who.REL.GEN be.PRS.3SG eye.NOM.PL that.M.NOM.SG see.PRS.3SG

    'He, who has eyes, can see'

    (http://charnobyl.ru/ya-shmat-chago-peradumala)

The distinction between descriptive instances of Inalienable Possession and instances, where it is the assertion of the possessive relation that is in focus, is very important in Belarusian, as already mentioned (5.1.5). It also has consequences on the statuts of the predicate: whereas in descriptive instances the predicate *ësc'* '(there) is' is typically covert, it is overt in expressions such as the one presented in 84.[55]. The contraposition between *u* + Gen. with overt *ësc'* '(there) is' and *u* + Gen. with covert *ësc'* is semantically relevant in Belarusian. In general, *ësc'* is overtly expressed whenever the expression has the meaning of focussing on the assertion of the possessive relation (Činčlej 1990:80ff.; her analyis applies to Belarusian as well). In 84. the presence of *ësc'* underlines the fact that the subject does have eyes, instead of presenting it as a presupposed fact.

According to Mrázak (1990:45), in East Slavic languages the predicate is overtly expressed when the possessive relation itself represents the communicatively most relevant element in the sentence. Mrázak poses also as a necessary condition for the predicate to be overt the alienability of the Possessee.

Actually, an expression like *U mjane **ësc'** sinija vočy* 'I do have blue eyes', with an inalienable Possessee, is possible, too. However, this would not be a description, as its correspondent with covert predicate *U mjane Ø sinija vočy* 'I have blue eyes'. Rather, the sentence *U mjane **ësc'** sinija vočy* would mean roughly "It is not true that I do not have blue eyes: I **do have** them" or "**as far as blue eyes are concerned**, I have them".

---

[55] In the present tense Belarusian has the possibility to express (a.) or not (b.) the predicate *ësc'* 'is' (in the past and future tense 'be' must always be overt):

    a. *U mjane   Ø novaja mašyna*
       At I.GEN   new.NOM.SG   car.NOM.SG
       'I **have** a new car'
    b. *U mjane **ësc'**   novaja mašyna*
       At I.GEN be.PRS.3SG new.NOM.SG car.NOM.SG
       'I **do have** a new car'

The same phenomenon is registered in Russian, as well as in Ukrainian. In all these languages, the copula is usually skipped: Russ. *on učitel'* 'he is a teacher', lit. 'he teacher'. The copula drops off in locative statements as well: Bel. *ën u Mensku* 'he is in Minsk', lit. 'he in Minsk'. The present form of 'be' can be covertly expressed in existential sentences, too: Russ. *zdes' (est') mnogo ljudej* 'here **there are** many people', lit. 'here (there are) many people'. As said in the first chapter of this work, the predicate 'be' in possessive constructions, such as *u* + Gen., should be considered as a existential predicate.

5.3.2.6 Temporary and Physical Possession

U + Gen. may be used to express Temporary Possession, as in the example presented in 85., where the meaning of Temporary Possession is desumable from the context: the oppositionists had the textbooks in their possession at the moment of the arrest, but it is not clear whether these also belonged or them or not.

85. **"U apazycyjaneraŭ byli padručniki pa tèraryz'me"**.
at oppositionist.GEN.PL be.PST.PL textbook.NOM.PL by terrorism.LOC.SG

Peršy kanal pavedamiŭ pra zatryman'ne na
first.M.NOM.SG channel.NOM.SG communicate.PST.M.SG about arrest.ACC.SG on

belaruska-pol'skaj mjažy čatyroch pradstaŭnikoŭ
Belarusian-Polish.F.LOC.SG border.LOC.SG four.GEN.PL member.GEN.PL

apazycyi u noŭtbukach jakich, nibyta, byli
opposition.GEN.SG in notebook.LOC.PL which.GEN.PL allegedly be.PST.PL

znojdzeny dapamožniki pa tèraryz'me
found.NOM.PL textsbook.NOM.PL by terrorism.LOC.SG

"Oppositionists had textbooks of terrorism": the First Channel has informed about the arrest, on the Belarusian-Polish border, of four members of the opposition, in whose notebooks, allegedly, textbooks of terrorism have been found

U + Gen. may also occurr in expressions of Physical or Temporary possession. In this case it is always accompanied by a locative or a comitative adjunctive, such as *pry sabe* 'at oneself', *z saboj* 'with oneself', that have the function of specifying that the relation is of Physical possession (86a.) and not of ownership (86b.).

86. a. *U Aly zaŭsëdy byli* **pry sabe** *hrošy*
at Ala.GEN always be.PST.PL at PRN.REFL.LOC money.NOM.PL
'Ala always had money **on her'**

b. *U Aly zaŭsëdy byli hrošy*
at Ala.GEN always be.PST.PL money.NOM.PL
'Ala had always money (she was never "broke")'

Unlike *mec'*, but like *turèti*, *u* + Gen. may be used in the locative expression 'to have (= to hold) in one's hand':

87. *Ne   treba   pahražac'   tamu,   **u kaho   ŭ rukach***

NEG   need.ADVERBIAL menace.INF   that.M.DAT.SG   at who.REL.GEN.SG   in hand.LOC.PL

zbroja!

weapon.NOM.SG

'One should not menace a person, who **has a weapon in his hand!**'

5.3.3 *Pry*

The preposition *pry* may be used in Belarusian to express relations of Physical Possession. In the corpus, ca.2000 occurrences of *pry* have been found, of which 250 have been analyzed. 28 of them expressed Physical Possession. In seven cases, *pry* is used alone:

88. *Ja   skazaŭ,   što   z   saboj   tėlefon   ne   braŭ,*

I.NOM   say.PST.M.SG   COMP with PRN.REFL.INS telephone.ACC.SG   NEG   take.PST.M.SG

*choc' **on   byŭ   pry   mne***

though he.NOM   be.PST.M.SG   at   I.LOC

'I said that I did not bring my mobile phone with me, though **I had it on me**'

Much more often, however, *pry* is used in association with either *mec'* or *u* + Gen. (in 21 out the 28 total possessive occurrences). In this case, the *pry*-phrase transforms an ownership meaning into a meaning of Physical Possession (like in the examples above, 86a. e b.):

89. a. *Ja   im   pakazaŭ   pašpart,   use   svae*

I.NOM   they.DAT   show.PST.M.SG   passport.ACC.SG   all.ADJ.ACC.Pl own.ACC.PL

dokumenty,   jakija   meŭ   pry   sabe

document.ACC.PL which.ACC.PL   have.PST.M.SG at   PRN.REFL.LOC

'I showed them my pasport, all documents **I had with me**'

b. *Ja im pakazaŭ pašpart, use svae dokumenty, jakija **meŭ***

'I showed them my passports, all the documents I had (= all the documents **I possessed**)'[56]

It is clear that *pry* retains its local meaning in all the expressions quoted above, for instances of Physical Possession are emintently locative relations, on the very border with the domain of proper Possession. When *pry* accompanies *mec'* and *u* + Gen. its function seems to be the same as the function of the locative adjunct *kalja sjabe* in 90.:

---

[56] In this case, an interpretation of Temporary Possession is also possible: 'I showed them my passport, all the documents I had (in that moment; in that particolar period)'.

90.   *Chlopec*   *meŭ*   *kalja sabe*   *hazetu*

        boy.NOM.SG   have.PST.M.SG   near   PRN.REFL.GEN newspaper.ACC.SG

        'The boy had a newspaper next to him'

91.   a.   *Chlopec*   *meŭ*   *pry sabe*   *hrošy*

        boy.NOM.SG   have.PST.M.SG   at   PRN.REFL.LOC money.ACC.PL

    b.   *U chlopca*   *byli*   *pry* *sabe*   *hrošy*

        at boy.GEN.SG be.PST.PL at   PRN.REFL.LOC money.ACC.PL

        'The boy had money on him'

However, these expressions differ from one another. The first – as already indicated - is clearly a mere locative relation, where the role of *mec'* is purely structural: it serves to put the reference-point, the most relevant element in the sentence, in topical position and to encode it as a nominative agent. I argue that in the case of *pry* the relation is no more exclusively locative, but it already moves towards the realm of Possession. This is why expressions like *mec' pry sabe, u mjane pry sabe* can be considered expressions of Physical Possession, whereas expressions like *mec' kalja sjabe* 'to have near oneself' must be considered as instances of Location.

Pry may also occur in the idiomatic expression *byc' pry hrašach* (taraš. *hrašoch*)'to be rich, to have money' [lit. 'to be at money']. This is probably a calque from the corresponding Russian expression: *byt' pri den'gach* 'id.'[57].

5.3.4 *Za* + Instr.

Šuba (1993), listing the possible meanings of the preposition *za*, also includes a possessive meaning: "(*za* + Instr.[58]) is used to indicate the person, to whom something belongs. *Dzjaljanka za im* ['the plot (of land) belongs to him/ is his']"(http://slounik.org/153312.html; my translation). Zolotova (1988:255), among the possible meanings of *za* + Instr. in Russian, lists a possessive meaning too, and provides an example from Puskin: **Venec za nim!** *On car'! On soglasilsja!* '**The crown is his!** He is the czar! He has accepted!'. Zolotova also underlines the fact, that very often *za* + Instr. can be found with other auxiliary verbs such as *ostavat'sja* 'remain', *čislit'sja* 'to count'. The same analysis is valid for Belarusian too, where *za* is also found with verbs such as *ličycca* 'to count', *zastavacca* 'remain'[59].

---

[57] The same in Lithuanian: *būti prie pinigo* 'to be at money → to be rich'.

[58] *Za* may be used with the Accusative case too. In this case, it expresses a movement: 'following', 'going behind', and it is therefore excluded from the list of possible sources of possessive constructions (as it does not either express a stative locative relation (Location schema) nor a movement towards a definite goal (Goal schema)).

[59] Actually, I think the Belarusian constructions with *za* + Instr. should be considered as a calque from the correspondent Russian constructions. This point should still be clarified through an analysis of the Belarusian dialects.

Like the example quoted by Šuba and its English translation clearly shows, the possessive use of *za* cannot be considered as an instance of 'having' but rather of 'belonging'. In the corpus, out of 250 analyzed occurrences of *za* + Instr., only seven have a possessive meaning. They all express Abstract Possession (92., 93..):

92. *A tam…**Peramoha**   **budze**   **za**   **nami**!   *[…] - Oj, bajusja […],*   **ne**
     and there victory.NOM.SG   be.FUT.3SG behind we. INS   Oh fear.PRS.1SG   NEG

     budze   ***za***   ***nami.*** ***Za***   ***kim'sci***,   *moža, i budze,*   *ale ne*
     be.FUT.3SG behind we.INS   behind someone.INS maybe and be.FUT.3SG but not

     za   *nami*
     behind we.INS

     'And there…**Victory will be ours**! […] – Oh, I'm afraid that […] **it will not be ours**. **It will be someone's**, maybe, but not ours'

93. *I ën,   čalavek,   u hėtaj   barac'be   ne peška:*
     and he.NOM man.NOM.SG in this.F.LOC.SG   battle.LOC.SG NEG pawn.NOM.SG

     vybar *[…]* ***za***   ***im***
     choice.NOM.SG behind   he.INS

     'And he, the man, is not a pawn in this battle: **the choice** […] **is up to him**'

The possessive meaning of *za* + Instrumental may also be seen in phraseologisms like *slova za mnoju* [lit. 'word behind me'] 'I have the floor' and *doŭh ličycca za im* [lit. 'debt counts behind him'] 'the debt is on him'.

However, it must be remarked that the expressions above mentioned might also be interpreted not as instances of Possession, but rather as of (metaphorical) location: *victory is behind us* → 'victory will be on our side (for us)'.

5.4 The Location schema in Lithuanian

In Lithuanian the Location schema does not represent a source of possessive constructions. However, in the colloquial language, *pas* 'at' + Acc. may be used to express Possession.

5.4.1 Constructions without possessive meaning

The following constructions have never been attributed in the scientific literature to a possessive meaning (Šukys 1998):

ant + Gen. 'on'; *prie* + Gen. 'at'; *už* + Gen. 'behind'; *prieš* + Acc. 'in front of', *po* + Instr. 'under'

The corpus analysis has confirmed this judgment. Around 150 occurrences of each construction have been analyzed, but none of them has resulted in being used to express possessive relations.

5.4.2 *Pas* + Acc.

Pas 'at' + Acc. is very often used to express Possession in colloquial, sub-standard Lithuanian. This use has been seen as the result of language contact with Slavic, from which the construction has been calqued, on the model of *u* + Gen. (Fraenkel 1929:84; Šukys 1998:438ff.):

> 'the preposition *pas* has no other meanings [apart from the adessive and allative ones, L.M.]. However, the Slavic languages, in which the sphere of use of the preposition *u* (which corresponds to *pas*) is much wider, have already influenced Lithuanian so much, that mistakes in the use of *pas* are widely diffused. These mistakes are mostly widespread among the inhabitants of big cities (because of the diffused bilingualism) and among South Aukštaitian (Dzūkians), who live on the border with Slavic territories. However, many young men also, who speak other dialects [than South Aukštaitian, L.M.], after coming home from having served in the Russian army have begun to say *Ar pas jus nėra (= Ar neturite) degtukų?* 'Do you have matches?', and similar things'.
> (Šukys 1998:438; my translation, italics by the author)

According to Šukys, thus, two different Slavic influences can be distinguished: Firstly, the influence of the Belarusian dialects on the South Aukštaitian dialects and, secondly, the influence of Russian on the sub-standard, colloquial language.

In the corpus over 9,000 occurrences of *pas* have been found. However, in none of them *pas* had a possessive meaning (but for one, see below). On the Internet, on the contrary, its frequency is quite high. The problem with data gathered from the Internet, yet, has already been pointed out (4.3): it is quite difficult, if not impossible, to distinguish between texts written by Lithuanian native speakers and texts written by Russian native speakers, writing in Lithuanian. However, keeping in mind the partial unreliability of the data, the picture resulting from the occurrences collected on the Internet is that *pas* + Acc is widely used in colloquial speech to express all possessive notions (see below).

Most native speakers I have asked about the grammaticality of the constructions with possessive *pas* have considered them ungrammatical, and they have suggested replacing *pas* with *turėti*. Their rejection of *pas*, however, should rather be seen as a form of 'self-control', induced by the strong puristic campaign against Russian influence on Lithuanian. In fact, most informants, when explicitly asked about this point, admitted that they do actually use *pas* + Acc. to express Possession in informal speech, but that they would avoid it in written texts or in more controlled speech.

As for the possessive notions *pas* may express, some native speakers have rejected its use as ungrammatical (even in situations of informal speech) for the expression of Inalienable, Inanimate and Abstract possession. The data gained from the internet, however, attest that *pas* may be used to

express these notions as well. Šukys (1998:439-440) mentions some examples of *pas* used to express Inalienable (***pas jį*** *gražios akys* 'she has beautiful eyes' [lit. '**at her** beautiful eyes']) and Abstract Possession (***pas Vaižgantą*** *įdomus stilius* 'Vaižgantas has an interesting style' [lit. '**at Vaižgantas** interesting style']).

5.4.2.1 Possessive *pas* in the corpus

As mentioned above, in the corpus no occurrences of possessive *pas* + Acc. have been found, but for one. However, in two cases, *pas*, though retaining its locative meaning, is used in expressions ambiguous between the meanings of Location and Temporary Possession. Such cases should be not ascribed to Russian influence, as in them the meaning of *pas* is eminently locative. On a latent level, though, a possessive meaning may be found too: this testifies the conceptual closeness of Location and Temporary Possession:

94. *Vida,* **iš kur pas jus** *šitos* *nuotraukos?* – *[…] - Tos,*
Vida from where at you.PL.ACC this.F.NOM.PL photo.NOM.PL? – this.F.NOM.PL.,
kur[ios] *ant* *stalo?*
which..F.NOM.PL on table.GEN.SG?
'Vida, where did you get these photos from [lit. '**from where at you these photos'**] ? – [...] -
The ones, that are on the table?'

95. *Berniukas* *ateina* *į knygyną* *ir klausia* *pardavėją:* -
child.NOM.SG come.PRS.3 in bookshop.ACC.SG and ask.PRS.3 shop-assistant.ACC.SG
Ar *nėra* **pas jus** *knygos* *apie* *kokį nors*
Q NEG.be.PRS.3 at you.PL.ACC book.GEN.SG about some.M.ACC.SG
garsų *vyrą,* *kuris* *mokykloje* *prastai*
famous.M.ACC.SG man.ACC.SG which.M.SG.NOM school.LOC.SG badly.ADV
mokėsi?
learn.PST.3
'A child enters a bookshop and asks the shop-assistant: **- Do you have a book** about some
famous person who did not do well at school?'

On the contrary, the following example is a clear calque from the Russian expression *čto **u vas za komanda** *'what a team you have'[60]. This interpretation is supported by the fact that the speaker reports words originally uttered in Russian:

---

[60] However, in the Russian as well as in the Lithuanian construction, the locative adjunct *u vas –pas jus* can also be interpreted as expressing location: *u vas (v Litve) – pas jus (Lietuvoje)* 'at you (in Lithuania)'.

96.   *Kai grįžtu į Maskvą visi jau žino*
when come_back.PRS.1SG in Moscow.ACC all.PRN.M.NOM.PL already know.PRS.3

rezultatus ."Kas pas jus per komanda - visus
result.ACC.PL what.NOM.SG at you.PL.ACC for team.ACC.SG all.PRN.M.ACC.PL

aplošiate", - juokauja draugai.
outplay.PST.3 joke.PRS.3 friend.NOM.PL

'When I come back to Moscow everyone already knows the results, and my friends joke:

"What a team you have – you outplayed all the others"'

5.4.2.2 Possessive *pas* on the Internet

As expected, I have found much more occurrences of possessive *pas* + Acc. on the Internet than in the corpus. In most cases, *pas* was used exactly as its Russian counterpart, even in the role of Experiencer–Possessor (in Lithuanian it is generally the dative case that fulfils the Experiencer role, whilst in Russian this role may be fulfilled by *u* + Gen., see Weiss 1999:175):

97.   *Sveiki pas mane liežuvis yra sutrukinėjęs [...] Pas ką*
Hallo at I.ACC tongue.NOM.SG be.PRS.3 dry.PaPA.M.NOM.SG at who.REL.ACC.SG

dar taip yra?
also so be.PRS.3

'Hallo, my tongue is dry [lit. '**at me the tongue'**][…] Who else has this happened to?'
(http://uzdarbis.lt/t159344/sveiki-pas-mane-liezuvis-yra-sutrukinejas/)

In many cases it is difficult to distinguish between a locative and a possessive meaning. In 98. *pas* could actually mean 'you have not this file' or 'in your operative system there is not such file':

98.   *Pas mane nėra net ant windows 7 to seswow62*
at I.ACC NEG.be.PRS.3 actually on windows 7 this.M.GEN.SG seswow62

kazkokio Jeigu pas tave nėra to aplanko,
certain.M.GEN.SG If at you.SG.ACC NEG.be.PRS.3 this.M.GEN.SG file.GEN.SG

reiškia tavo Windows yra 32bit
mean.PRS.3 you.SG.GEN Windows be.PRS.3 32bit

'On Windows 7 I haven't this seswow62 (sic!) or whatever. – **If you don't have this file**, that means that your Windows is 32bit'

The meaning of *pas* in the following example is quite hard to define. *Pas* may be considered as having an implicational-possessive meaning: 'I have repaired what was broken *among **your** things*,

in your car'. In this case, it is used exactly as its Russian counterpart: *čto **u tebja** slomalos',
otremantiroval* 'I have repaired what was broken in your car' [lit. 'what at you (was) broken, I have
repaired']:

99. *Man   regis   tau   paranoja.   Kas   **pas tave***
I.DAT   seem.PRES.3 you.SG.DAT paranoia.NOM.SG what.REL.NOM.SG at you.SG.ACC
buvo   sulaužyta   (tachometras),   pataisiau
be.PST.3 broken.PPP.N.NOM.SG tachometer.NOM.SG   repair.PST.1SG
'It seems to me that you are paranoich. I repaired what was broken [in your car, lit. '**at you'**](the
tachometer)'
(http://www.audiklubas.com/forumas/index.php?topic=100885.20)

As far as I could verify on the Internet, *pas* is mostly used to express Abstract (100.) and Inalienable
possession (101., 102.). It can even express Inanimate Possession (103.), though the latter use is
very rare, even on the Internet[61].

100. *Vat   **pas mane ta   pati   problema**,   kartais   net*
INTER at   I.ACC this.F.NOM.SG   same F.NOM.SG problem.NOM.SG sometimes even
nežinau   iš   kur   atsiranda   didžiausia   mėlynė
NEG.know.PRS.1SG   from where show_up.PRS.REFL.3   biggest.F.NOM.SG bruise.NOM.SG
'There, **I have the same problem**, sometimes I don't even know, how I got a big bruise'
(http://www.supermama.lt/forumas/lofiversion/index.php/t6971.html)

101. *Gintare, kokios   gražios   akys   **pas tave!***
Gintarė which.F.ACC.PL   beautiful.F.NOM.PL   eye.NOM.PL at you.SG.ACC
'Gintarė, what **beautiful eyes you have!'**
(http://www.tuiras.lt/replyForm.php?id=110418233910499950&tema=1011)

102. *Nes   **pas mano šuniuką**   **uodegytė   sulaužyta…***
because at   I.GEN doggy.ACC.SG   tail.NOM.SG broken.PPP.N.NOM.SG
'Because my little doggy's tail is broken…[lit. '**at my dog'**]
(http://www.bone.lt/bone-klubai/Stafordsyroterjeru/Laisvalaikis/Susitikimai/,offset.40)

103. *Kompas   turi   tik   vieną   LPT ir   5 USB.   Ar*
computer.NOM.SG   have.PRS.3   only one.ACC.SG LPT and 5 USB   Q

---

[61] In the sentence in 100. a Russicizm may be observed: *iš kur **atsiranda*** [lit. 'from where (it) shows up.REFL'], a calque
from the correspondent Russian expression *otkuda **pojavilas'**.* This fact might be the proof that the author of the above mentioned
sentence is a speaker of Russian (who might, therefore, use in his/her speech constructions, taken from his/her mother tongue –
includine *pas*).

112

negalima   *padaryti, kad* **pas** **kompą**   *būtų*

impossible.ADVERBIAL do.INF   COMP at   computer.ACC.SG be.COND.3

keletas LPT

 some.PRN.NOM.SG LPT

'The computer has only one LPT and five USB. Is it possible to do something, so that the computer will have some LPT?'

(http://www.biteplius.lt/lt/2forum.showPosts/374896.461-=%28866683731)

I have found no examples of *pas* used to express ownership, but native speakers have confirmed that *pas* can be used to express it as well (of course, only in colloquial speech). As for Physical Possession, an example has already been mentioned above: *Ar **pas Jus** nėra degtukų?* 'do you have matches?' (Šukys 1998:438).

I did not find any instances of *pas* + Acc. used to express Temporary Possession. However, the examples shown above, that have been found in the corpus (94., 95.), are borderline between Temporary Possession and Location. Činčlej (1990:56) considers a sentence like *Knyga pas Joną* 'the book is at Jonas' place' as an instance of Location, distinguishing it from the sentence *Knygą turi Jonas* 'Jonas has the book', which she labels as Temporary Possession. It is clear though, that a clear distinction between the two notions can be made only in the context.

Just like in the case of Russian and Belarusian construction *u* + Gen., also in the costruction *pas* + Acc. the predicate 'be' in the present tense may be overt or covert. As far as I could verify, in Lithuanian, as well as in Belarusian, the predicate is usually covert whenever the sentences is a physical description: *pas ją *yra gražios akys* 'she has beautiful eyes' [lit. 'at her is beautiful eyes]. It may be overtly expressed, conversely, whenever the possessive relation is in focus.

As Činčlej (1990:83) underlines, the overt 'be' may express a permanent situation, whereas the covert 'be' expresses a rather temporary situation: *u Tani **est'** novaja šuba - u Tani novaja šuba* 'Tanja has a new fur (she possesses it) - Tanja has a new fur on (now)'. A similar meaning may be found in Lithuanian *pas* + Acc.. At least, I have found some examples, that describe a permanent situation of illness, where *yra* 'is/are' is overtly expressed:

104.   *Mano*   *vaikas*   *nėra*   *hiperaktyvus*   *pas*   *jį*   **yra**

        I.GEN   child.NOM.SG NEG.be.PRS.3 hyperactive.M.NOM.SG at   he.ACC be.PRS.3

        nerimo   *sindromas*

        anxiety.GEN.SG   disorder.NOM.SG

        'My child is not hyperactive, he has an anxiety disorder'

        (http://www.supermama.lt/forumas/lofiversion/index.php/t819986.html)

Conversely, with the substantive *gripas* 'flu', that usually indicates a temporary illness, I have found no instances of *pas* + Acc. with overt *yra*, but only with covert predicate: *pas mane *yra gripas* 'I have got the flu'.

5.5 The Goal schema in Belarusian

The Goal schema gives birth in Belarusian to possessive constructions where the Possessor receives the dative encoding. The use of the possessive dative is quite marginal[62] in the contemporary standard.

5.5.1 Abstract Possession

The dative case may be used to express Abstract Possession, and in the following contexts:

(i) in association with nouns such as *mesca*, 'place'; *imja*, 'name', *čas*, 'time'

105. ***Žančyne*.   *mesca*   *na*   *kuchni*
     woman.DAT.SG place.NOM.SG in   kitchen.LOC.SG
     'The **place of the woman** is in the kitchen'

106. *Tyja   asoby [...]   pavinny   vystupac' [...]   ad   kolaŭ*
     this.NOM.PL persons.NOM.PL obliged.NOM.PL   come_from.INF from   circle.GEN.PL
     *šyrokich,   **jakim   užo   imja** –   NACYJA*
     larger.GEN.PL which.DAT.PL already name.NOM.SG   nation.NOM.SG
     'These persons[…] must come from [..] some larger circles, **whose name is** already **NATION**'

(ii) to express age

107. ***Majmu   mužu***   *76 hadoŭ*
     my.M.DAT.SG husband.DAT.SG   76 year.GEN.PL
     'My husband is 76 years old'

108. ***Maëj   dačce***   *cjaper 15   hadoŭ...*
     my.F.DAT.SG daughter.DAT.SG now   15   year.GEN.PL
     'My daughter is now 15-years-old'

---

[62] Šarić 2002 claims that, in Belarusian, the dative of possession is limited to pronominal forms: *ty vorah **mne*** 'you are an enemy to me: you are my enemy' (ib.:19). Actually, nominals can appear in the dative case too, as shown below.

Interestingly, in this case *u* + Gen. is not available: ***u maëj dački** 15 hadoŭ* 'id.'. On the contrary, *mec'* is grammatical:

> 109.   *Sjaredni*   *belaruski*   *čynoŭnik [...]*   **mae**
> typical.M.NOM.SG Belarusian M.NOM.SG   bureaucrat.NOM.SG   have.PRS.3SG 54
> *54 hady*
> year.ACC.PL
> 'The typical Belarusian bureaucrat is 54 years old' [lit. '**has** 54 years']

The corpus data have not been of much help in determining which one of the two constructions is the most frequent one in expressions of age. Out of twelve occurrences found in the corpus, seven presented the dative case and five *mec'*. The two constructions are equally distributed (both from a quantitative and a qualitative – type of text, author, etc.- point of view) and native speakers also did not find any difference, neither in meaning nor in preference of use between them.

5.5.2 Social Possession

Dative constructions may be used to express Social Possession as well. According to native speakers, the use of the dative case in the field of Social Possession has an 'archaizing' flavour (cf. the example 110., taken from the Bible - whose language is, as it is known, quite archaizing):

> 110.   *Bo chto*   *budze*   *vykonvac'*   *volju*   *Ajca*   *Majho [...]*
> For who.REL.NOM.SG   be.FUT.3SG   accomplish.INF will.ACC.SG father.GEN.SG my.GEN.SG
> *toj **Mne brat***   *i*   *sjastra,*   *i*   *maci*
> that.M.NOM.SG I.DAT brother.NOM.SG   and sister.NOM.SG   and mother.NOM.*SG*
> 'For whoever does the will of My Father [..] is My [lit. 'to me'] brother and sister, and mother'(Mt 12,50)
> 111.   *Tam kožny*   **mne**   *svajak*
> there every.M.NOM.SG   I.DAT   relative.NOM.SG
> 'Everyone there is a relative of mine [lit. **'to me'**]
> (Narkevič 1972:70)

In the corpus, most occurrences of relational nouns such as *sjabar* 'friend, comrade', *brat* 'brother' are accompanied by a genitive modifier: *sjabar **majho bac'ki***, 'my father's friend', and only a small percentage was associated to a dative Possessor[63].

---

[63] Possessive dative constructions, however, can only express relations of 'belonging' ('he is my husband'), and not of 'having' ('I have a husband'). In the latter function only 'either *u* + Gen. or *mec'* can be employed: ***u mjane** ësc' brat*, at me.GEN brother, 'I have a brother', *ja **maju** brata* I have brother. 'id.'.

When considering the role of dative case in the expression of Social Possession another issue must be considered. An expression like *ën mne brat* lit. 'he me.DAT brother' is highly ambiguous, as it can be interpreted both as 'he is *my* (biological) brother' and 'he is *like* a brother *to me*'[64]. In some cases, the meaning is clear: In 112., evidently, *tabe* is to be understood as 'to you':

112. *Ja*   ***tabe***   *ne   žonka,*   *a   tovar*
     I.NOM you.SG.DAT   NEG wife.NOM.SG   but good.NOM.SG
     '**To you** I am not a wife, but a thing'

In order to solve the ambiguity, Belarusian may use the preposition *dlja* 'for' + Gen., as it excludes the possibility of a real, biological (and legal, in the case of the relation wife-husband) relation, or the preposition *jak* 'as, like', both with the dative and with *dlja*. Similarly, the genitive case solves the ambiguity in the other direction, as it can express only a biological relation.
The dative case, on the contrary, allows both readings:

113. a. *Ën*   ***dlja mjane*** *jak brat*   *// Ën*   ***mne*** *jak brat*
        he.NOM for I.GEN   like brother.NOM.SG //   he.NOM I.DAT like brother.NOM.SG
        'He is like a brother to me'

    b. *Ën*   ***moj***   *brat*
        he.NOM   my.NOM.SG   brother.NOM
        'He is my brother'

    c. *Ën*   ***mne***   *brat*
        he.NOM I.DAT brother.NOM.SG
        'He is my brother/ he is like a brat to me'

In the corpus, however, only few examples of dative constructions expressing social relations have been found. In Belarusian, at any rate, dative constructions can be used to express Social Possession only in copular sentences, i.e, in statements of identity: 'he is my brother'. In no way can they be used in expressions, where the assertion of Possession is in focus.
 In this case, *mec'* or *u* + Gen. are the only available options: **mne ësc' dačka // maju dačku – u mjane ësc' dačka* 'I have a daughter'

---

[64] Native speakers have told me, they would not use the dative case in the case of ascending relations: ?*ën mne bac'ka* 'he is my father // he is like a father to me'.

5.6 The Goal schema in Lithuanian

In Lithuanian, as well as in Belarusian, the Goal schema is also present. The Possessor is encoded in the dative case, and the Possessee in the nominative case. Possessive dative constructions fulfil in Lithuanian only a marginal role in the expression of Possession, even if they have a broader scope of use than in Belarusian.

According to Šukys (1998:162), possessive dative constructions are quite diffused in the Northern dialects of Lithuanian. He invokes language contact with Latvian – a language that uses a dative construction to express Possession – to explain this convergence. Šukys brings some examples of dative constructions used for the expression of Abstract (114.) and Inanimate (115.) Possession:

114. ***Jums***   *energijos*   *yra*   *daugiau*   *negu*   ***mums, jauniems***
      you.PL.DAT   vigour.GEN.SG   be.PRS.3   more.ADV   than   we.DAT   young.DAT.PL
      'You **have more vigour** than we, though young, have'

115. ***Meilei***   *tūkstančiai*   *vardų,*
      love.DAT.SG thousand.NOM   name.GEN.PL
      'Love has a thousand names'

In standard Lithuanian, the scope of use of the possessive dative is limited to Abstract, Social and some cases of Inalienable Possession.

5.6.1 Abstract possession

(i) Diseases

116. *Mama*   *tuomet jau*   *labai*   *sirgo,*   ***jai***   ***buvo***   ***vėžys***
      Mama.NOM.SG then   already   much.ADV   be_ill.PST.3 she.DAT   be.PST.3   cancer.NOM.SG
      'Mama at that time was already very ill, **she had cancer**'

In this field the dative case may also alternate with *turėti*. Činčlej (1990:66) brings the example of *aš **turiu** slogą* 'I have a cold', declaring it perfectly acceptable[65]. In the corpus, however, I have found examples of *turėti* with Possessees denoting diseases only when an indefinite verbal form – participle, infinitive- was needed:

117. *Kiekvienoje*   *šeimoje*   *yra*   *vaikas -*   *ar astmatikas,*   *ar*
      every.F.LOC.SG   family.LOC.SG be.PRS.3S   child.NOM.SG   or   asthmatic.M.NOM.SG   or

---

[65] The data collected on the Internet confirm Činčlej's claim, as the expression *aš turiu slogą* is quite frequent.

alerginę slogą   turintis

allergic.F.ACC.SG cold.ACC.SG have.PPA.M.NOM.SG

'In every family there is a child – either asthmatic, or who **has an allergic cold**'

Some diseases, as *gripas* 'flu' distinctly dislike *turėti*: I haven't found any occurrences of **turėti gripą* 'to have flu', not even on the Internet and not even with indefinite verbal forms.

(ii) Age:

Exactly like Belarusian, Lithuanian has also the possibility of expressing age with both a dative (118.) as well as with a 'have' construction (119.):

118. *Pavadinkime   moterį   B.* ***Jai   dar   nėra   nė   40-ies,   -***

call.IMP.1PL   mother.ACC.SG B. she.DAT still   NEG.be.PRS.3 not 40-GEN.SG

sūnui   16.

son.DAT.SG 16

'Let us call the woman B. **She is not yet forty years old**, **her son is sixteen**.'

119. *Jo   sūnus   Izidorius [...]* ***jau   turėjo   17   metų,***   *kai [...]*

he.GEN   son.NOM.SG   Izidorius.NOM.SG already have.PST.3 17   year.GEN.PL when

buvo   įrengti   dabartiniai   vargonai

be.PST.3 installed.PPP.M.NOM.PL actual M.NOM.PL   organ.NOM.PL

'His son Izidorius […] **was already seventeen years old**, [lit. 'already had seventeen years'] when the actual organ was installed'

The corpus analysis has showed that the dative case is the preferred option: Out of 53 occurrences examined, in 16 of them *turėti* was used, in the other 37 the dative case. Moreover, again, most occurrences of *turėti* were non-finite forms:

120. *Gimęs   Kaune,* ***turėdamas   14 metų***

be_born.PaPA.M.NOM.SG   Kaunas.LOC   have.GER.M.NOM.SG 14 year.GEN.PL A.

A.Liepinaitis   1944 m.   pasitraukė   į Vakarus

Liepinaitis.NOM 1944 y[ear] move.PST.REFL.3 in West.ACC.PL

'Born in Kaunas, at the age of 14 (lit. 'being 14 years old') A.Liepinaitis moved to the West'

5.6.2 Social Possession

In Lithuanian, like in Belarusian, the dative case may be used to express a kinship relationship, with the same degree of ambiguity already observed for Belarusian:

121. *Jis **man*** ['to me'] *sūnus*, 'he is my son // he is for me like a son'

Like in Belarusian, the use of a genitive solves the ambiguity[66]:

122. *Jis **mano*** ['my'] *sūnus* 'he is my son'

In a few examples from the corpus the relation asserted through a dative case was indeed a biological one (123.):

123. *Kartą [...]*   *mano*   *žmona [...]*   *pervysto*   *apsišlapinusį*   *mūsų*
     once   I.GEN   wife.NOM.SG   change.PRS.3   wet.PaPA.F.ACC.SG   we.GEN
     meilės   *vaisių [...] . - **Tu***   ***tam***   ***vaikui***   ***tėvas***   ***ar***
     love.GEN.SG   fruit.ACC.SG   you.SG.NOM this.M.DAT.SG   child.DAT.SG   father.NOM.SG or
     ***ne?** [..]*   *Kodėl klausi?*   *[...]*   *Nejaugi vėl   abejoji?*
     not   why   ask.PRS.2SG   maybe   still   doubt.PRS.2SG
     'Once […] my wife […] changes the fruit of our love, who has got wet. – **Are you the father of this child or not**? – [...] – Why do you ask? Do you still have doubts?'

In some other cases the relation is clearly not possessive:

124. *Kas*   ***Jums***   *yra*   *telefonas* -   *draugas*   *ar*
     what.REL.NOM.SG you.PL.DAT   be.PRS.3   telephone.NOM.SG − friend.NOM.SG or
     priešas?
     enemy.NOM.SG?
     'What does **the telephone represent to you** – a friend or an enemy?'
125. *Mildutės*   *motina*   *mirusi**.***   ***Tėvui***   ***ji***   ***buvo***   ***tik***
     Mildutė.GEN mother.NOM.SG   die.PaPA.F.NOM.SG   father.DAT.SG she.NOM be.PST.3 just
     ***tarnaitė**.*
     servant.NOM.SG
     'Mildutė's mother is dead. **To her father** she was just **a servant**'

As in the case of Belarusian, in the matter of Social Possession, the dative constructions exclusively express copular relations, identity statements: 'he is my brother, my father'. Otherwise, *turėti* is the only available option: *Aš **turiu** sūnų* / ***man** sūnus* 'I have a son'

---

[66] Lithuanian lacks a benefactive preposition like Belarusian *dlja* 'for', and it uses as an alternative the bare dative to express Beneficiaries. Therefore, ambiguity can only be solved with the use of a genitive.

5.6.3 Inalienable Possession: "Incomplete" physical details

According to Činčlej (1990:70), dative constructions may also be used in Lithuanian with what she defines as "incomplete details" (little physical details such as 'bags (under one's eyes)', 'bruises'):

126. **Jam**   yra   **mėlynė**   po   akim
      he.DAT be.PRS.3SG bruise.NOM.SG   under eye.INS.SG
      'He **has a bruise** under his eye'
      (Činčlej 1990:70)

However, some of these little physical details, such as *apgama* 'birthmark', prefer instead *turėti*:

127. *Ji*   **turi**   **apgamą**   *ant skruosto*
      she.NOM have.PRS.3   birthmark.ACC.SG on cheeck.GEN.SG
      'She **has a birthmark** on her cheek'
      (*ibid.*)

Činčlej reports the judgement of some native speakers about the competition "*turėti* versus dative" in these cases. According to her, some informants defined the sentence *ji* **turi maišelius** *po akimis* 'she **has bags** under her eyes' ungrammatical, and they accepted only the variant with the dative case: **jai** *yra* **maišeliai** *po akimis* [lit.'to her are bags']. Some others, conversely, accepted the variant with *turėti,* but proposed a different interpretation for the two expressions: *turėti* would indicate a permanent characteristic of the subject ('she has *always* bags under her eyes'), while the dative case is used to designate a temporary characteristic ('*today* she has bags under her eyes')[67]. The native speakers I have asked for a further confirmation have also agreed on this interpretation. Moreover, the fact that *turėti* is preferred in the case of evidently permanent physical details such as *apgama* 'birthmark' seems to confirm this as well:

128. *Jūsų*   *draugė*   *niekada nesužinos,*   *kad*   *ant kaktos*
      you.PL.GEN girlfriend.NOM.SG never   NEG.know.FUT.3SG COMP   on head.GEN.SG
      turite apgamą
      have.PRS.2PL birthmark.ACC.SG
      'Your girlfriend will never know that **you have a birthmark** on your head'

---

[67] The fact that *turėti* is used to express permanent states, in contraposition to the dative case, agrees quite well with the primary function of the latter, which is to express ownership - an essentially permanent relation.

Some examples found on the Internet confirm the distinction "*turėti*: permanent characteristic" versus "dative: temporary characteristic" too :

129. *Jau   dveji   metai,   kai   man   tinsta   abiejų   kojų*
     already two.NOM.PL year.NOM.PL since I.DAT swell.PRS.3 both.GEN.PL leg.GENPL

     čiurnos […] *Tiek pat   laiko   turiu   "maišelius"   po   akimis*
     tarsus.NOM.PL So_much.ADV time.GEN.SG have.PRS.1SG bag.ACC.PL under eye.INS.PL

     'It's already two years, since the tarsus of my both legs began to swell […[**Since the
     same time I have "bags"** under my eyes'
     (http://www.sveikaszmogus.lt/index.php?pagrid=straipsnis&lid=2&strid=36108)

130. **Man** *po avarijos   **buvo** delno   dydžio   **mėlynė**   ant*
     I.DAT after accident.GEN.SG   be.PST.3 palm.GEN.SG size.GEN.SG   bruise.NOM.SG on

     šlaunies
     femur.GEN.SG

     '**After the accident I had a bruise** the size of a palm on the femur'
     (http://www.supermama.lt/forumas/lofiversion/index.php/t6971.html)

131. *Draugės   sako   jog […] vaikinams   nesvarbu   ar*
     girlfriend.NOM.PL say.PRS.3   COMP   boy.DAT.PL not.important.N.NOM.SG if

     ***turi   spuogų** ar ne*
     have.PRS.2SG   pimple.GEN.PL or NEG

     'My girlfriends say that boys don't care, whether **you have pimples or not'**
     (http://www.tuiras.lt/replyForm.php?id=120219183111477779&tema=1012)

132. *Išsitraukiau   iš   kišenės   šukas   ir susišukavau.   Bet*
     pull_out.PST.1SG from pocket.GEN.SG   brush.ACC.PL   and brush.REFL.PST.1SG but

     *čia prisiminiau,   kad **man   ant   nosies   spuogas***
     here remember.PST.1SG COMP I.DAT   on   nose.GEN.SG   pimple.NOM.SG

     'I pulled out of my pocket a brush and I brushed myself. But then **I remembered that I
     have a pimple on my nose'**

However, a further hypothesis might be advanced to explain the opposition 'dative case versus *turėti'*. Almost all the "incomplete details" that require or accept a dative Possessor are negative characteristics, "disease-like": 'bags (under one's eyes)', 'bruises', 'pimples'. On the contrary, quite "innocent" details like 'birthmark' do not accept the dative case. Therefore, it might be that, together with the opposition "permanent : temporary", the semantics of the "disease-like" 'incomplete-details' is also a determinant factor in the selection of the dative case: they are put

under the same category of diseases, that, as shown above, are often expressed by means of a dative construction.

5.7 The Companion schema in Belarusian

The Companion Schema is realized in Belarusian through the construction *z*, 'with', + Instr.. In the corpus 10.035 occurrences of *z* + Instr. have been found, of which 1000 occurrences have been analyzed. Among them, 96 have a possessive meaning, but they are all instances of adnominal Possession:

133. *Trysta   čalavek,   z' dzidami   i   šabljami*
     three_hundred   man.GEN.PL   with spear.INS.PL and   sword.INS.PL
     'Three hundred men **with spears and swords**'

134. *Pryhožy   anglijski   park   z   cėlym*
     beautiful.M.NOM.SG English.M.NOM.SG   park.NOM.SG   with   whole.M.INS.SG
     kaskadam štučnych azёraŭ
     range.INS.SG artificial.GEN.PL lakes.GEN.PL
     '(A) beautiful English park with a whole series of artificial lakes'

135. *Čalavek   z   perabitym   nosam*
     man.NOM.SG   with broken.M.INS.SG   nose.INS.SG
     '(A) man with a broken nose'

Among these occurrences of adnominal possessive *z* + Instr. the most represented notion was Inalienable Possession. In order to find only predicative occurrences of *z* + Instr., I have searched the corpus for the combination " *z* + [form of the verb *byc'* 'be']", and I have examined 650 of the resulted occurrences. Among them, only one instance of Possession has been found (Inanimate Possession):

136. *Peršyja   100 asobnikaŭ   "Veras'nja" buduc'   z   kaljadnym*
     First.NOM.PL   100 exemplar.GEN.PL "Verasen''   be.FUT.3PL with Christmas.ADJ.M.INS.SG
     bonusam –   *muzyčnymi   diskami   Eduarda   Akulina   i   Tac'cjany*
     bonus.INS.SG   musical.INS.PL records.INS.PL Eduard.GEN Akulin.GEN and Tac'cjana.GEN

Belanohaj

Belanohaja.GEN

'The first 100 exemplars of 'Verasen'' will **have a Christmas bonus**: records by Eduard Akulin and Tac'cjana Belanohaja'

In the questionnaires, I have presented to native speakers sentences the following sentence (see Appendix, 22.):

137. *U svjatlicu*   *zajšoŭ*   *vajavoda*   *Vislavus.*   *Ën*

In chamber.ACC.SG go_by.PST.M.SG vajavoda.NOM.SG Vislavus.NOM.SG he.NOM

byŭ   ***z***   ***karotkaj***   ***baradoj***   ***i***   ***sinimi***   ***vačyma****,*   *jaščė*

be.PST.M.SG with short.F.INS.SG   beard.INS.SG and blue.INS.PL eye.INS.PL   still

malady,   *ale trymaŭsja*   *pavažna,*   *jak pažyly*   *bayaryn.*

young.NOM.SG but behave.PST.REFL.M.SG seriously.ADV as old.NOM.SG boyar.NOM.S

'Voevod Vislavus went in the chamber. **He had a short beard and blue eyes** [lit. 'he was with short beard and blue eyes'], still young, but he behaved seriously, like an old boyar.'

Most native speakers have noticed nothing wrong in this sentence. Hence, we could assume that the use of a comitative adjunct in the expression of physical descriptions is grammatical. However, I have found in the corpus no occurrences of a comitative adjunct used predicatively in this context (whereas I have found several instances of attributive Inalienabile Possession). Moreover, in another case, native speakers have corrected the following formulation with *mec'* into an attributive (and not predicative!) one with *z* + Instr[68].(see Appendix, 10.) :

138. *Sa*   *svajho*   *kabineta*   *vyjšaŭ*   *čalavek,*   *mažny,*

from own.M.GEN.SG   office.GEN.SG go_out.PST.M.SG man.NOM.SG fat.M.NOM.SG

jaki   ***meŭ***   ***abvislyja***   ***vusy***   → ***čalavek***

which.M.NOM.SG have.PST.M.SG flabby.ACC.PL   moustache.ACC.PL   man.NOM.SG f

mažny   ***z***   ***abvislymi***   ***vusami***

at.NOM.SG with flabby.INS.PL moustache.INS.PL

'A fat man, who had a flabby moustache, went out from his cabinet → a fat man with a flabby moustache'

---

[68] However, in one case, an informant has proposed the following variant: *muž Aly byŭ z dobrym sėrcam* 'Ala's husband was with a good heart', instead of the ungrammatical **muž Aly byŭ dobraha sėrca*, lit. 'Ala's husband was of good heart' (see Appendix, questionnaire).

Finally, I have to remark that most native speakers have noticed nothing wrong in the following sentence, presented in the questionnaire (see Appendix, 24.):

139. *U 50-ja*   *hady*   *ŭse*   *bahatyja* *Italijcy*   **byli**   *z*
     in 50-ACC.PL year.ACC.PL all.NOM.PL rich.NOM.PL Italian.NOM.PL be.PST.PL   with

     tryma   **chatami**:   *adna*   *ŭ harach,*   *druhaja*   *na*
     three.INS.PL house.INS.Pl   one.F.NOM.Sg in mountain.LOC.PL other.F.NOM.SG   on

     mory,   *i* *trecjaja*   *ŭ horadze*
     sea.LOC.SG i   third.F.NOM.SG in town.LOC.SG

     'In the fifties, all rich Italians had [lit.**'were with'**] three houses: the one in the mountains, another at the seaside, and a third in the town.'

Here, the expressed notion is ownership. Only three informants, out of ten, have corrected it, and have replaced *z* + Instr. with *mec'*. However, I must say that, in the corpus, I have found no instances of *z* + Instr. used in predicative position to express ownership; and I have also never encountered such an usage in Belarusian texts or sppeches I have read/heard. Therefore, I admit that there might be the possibility that the Companion schema is used to express ownership in Belarusian in predicative position, but this usage, it seems to me, is quite marginal, and this construction has certainly not the same diffusion and importance as *mec'* or *u* + Gen.

5.8 The Companion schema in Lithuanian

The Companion schema is realized in Lithuanian through the construction *su* 'with' + Instr.
Just like in Belarusian, in Lithuanian comitative constructions are mostly used in attributive position too:

140. *Anubis –*   *tai*   *puikus*   **vyras**   **su**
     Anubis.NOM.SG   this.N.NOM.SG   handsome.M.NOM.SG   man.NOM.SG with

     šuns   **galva**
     dog.GEN.SG head.INS.SG

     'Anubis is a handsome **man with a dog's head**'

However, Lithuanian seems to admit comitative constructions in predicative contexts more than Belarusian.
I have examined 650 occurrences of predicative comitative constructions in Lithuanian. Whilst in Belarusian, out of the same amount of analyzed occurrences, just one of them has turned out to be

an instance of Possession, in Lithuanian the total amount of predicative comitative constructions used to express Possession is 27 (which is, however, still an extremely low rate of use)**.** They express all possessive notions but that of ownership:

Possessive notion	Occurrences
a. Inanimate Possession	17
b. Temporary Possession	4
c. Abstract Possession	3
d. Inalienable Possession	2
e. Social Possession	1

5.8.1 Inanimate Possession

141. *Kažkada jis rašė, turėjo daug pilnų sąsiuvinių […]*
everytime he.NOM write.PST.3 have.PST.3 much.ADV thick.GEN.PL notebook.GEN.PL
visi buvo su mėlynais viršeliais
all.PRN.NOM.PL be.PST.3 with blue.M.INS.PL cover.INS.PL
'Everytime he wrote, he had many thick notebooks […] **they all had blue covers'**

142. *A.Gustaitis mėgino dokumentais pagrįsti […] kad pirkimo*
A. Gustaitis.NOM try.PST.3 document.INS.PL find.INF COMP purchase.GEN.SG
*metu **namas** **jau** **buvęs** **su** **verandomis***
time.INS.SG house.NOM.SG already be.PaPA.M.NOM.SG with veranda.INS.PL
'A. Gustaitis tried to demonstrate with documents that at the time of the purchase **the house already had verandas'**

5.8.2 Temporary Possession

143. *Apie pusę trijų naktį kaukėtas vyriškis iš*
around half.ACC.SG three.GEN.PL night.ACC.SG masked.M.NOM.SG man.NOM.SG from
*kasininkės pareikalavo. pinigų Nors **užpuolikas** **buvo** **su***
cashier.GEN.SG order.PST.3 money.GEN.PL though aggressor.NOM.SG be.PST.3 with
***pistoletu,** moteris nesutriko ir įjungė signalizaciją*
gun.INS.SG woman.NOM.SG NEG.get_confused.PST.3 and turn_on.PST.3 alarm.ACC.SG
'Around two thirty in the night a masked man ordered the cashier to give him the money. Although **the aggressor had a gun** the woman did not get confused and turned on the alarm'

144. ***Janina   buvo   su   automobiliu*** *ir   tikino,   kad   tamsa*
      Janina.NOM be.PST.3 with car.INS.SG   and believe.PST.3 COMP darkness.NOM.SG

      J*os   nė kiek   nebaugina*
      she.GEN not much.ADV NEG.scare.PRS.3

      'Janina was with her car and believed that the darkness will not scare her at all'

5.8.3 Abstract Possession

In the corpus three examples of comitative constructions used to express Abstract possession have
been found. Two of them represent the lexicalised expression *būti su kvapu* 'to be drunk' [lit. 'to be
with smell'].

The third describes a characteristic of the Possessor: 'I am with sin → I am a sinner'.

145. *Sutikau   žmogų,   žinojau,   kad   buvo   teistas,   bet*
      meet.PST1SG man.ACC.SG know.PST.1SG COMP be.PST.3 judged.PPP.M.NOM.SG but

      pati   buvau   su   nuodėme, *todėl nesmerkiau   jo*
      self.F.NOM.SG be.PST.1SG with sin.INS.SG so   NEG.condemn.PST.1SG he.GEN

      'I met a man, I knew, that he had a criminal record, but I **had some sins** on myself as well, so I
      did not condemn him'

However, native speakers have rejected *su* + Instr. in the following example, and they have
suggested to substitute it either with *turėti (ji **turi** didelę ir gerą širdį* 'she has a big and good heart')
or with an adnominal genitive (***jos širdis*** *didelė ir gera* ,her heart is big and good')[69] (see
Appendix, 46.):

146. *Ema -   paprasta   moteris.*   ***Bet ji   *su didele   ir***
      Ema.NOM   simple.F.NOM.SG woman.NOM.SG   but she.NOM   with big.F.INS.SG and

      gera   širdimi
      good.F.INS.SG heart.INS.SG

      'Ema is a simple women. **But she has a big and good heart**'

5.8.4 Inalienable Possession

As for Inalienable Possession, comitative constructions are well accepted with Possessees like
'beard', 'moustache', 'sun-spots':

---

[69] In both cases, a bare Instrumental may be used : *jie **šviesiais veidais**.INSTR 'they have bright faces'. However, this is
not a possessive construction.

147. *Trečioji   mergytė   **buvo   su   tokiom   žaviom***
     Third.DEF.F.NOM.SG girl.NOM.SG   be.PST.3 with such.F.INS.PL   charming.F.INS.PL
     strazdanėlėm
     sunspot.INS.PL
     'The third girl **had such charming little sun-spots**'

Činčlej claims, that comitative constructions may be used with Possessees such as 'eyes', 'hair' as well:

148. *Ji   **su žaliom   akim,   garbanuotais   plaukais***
     she.NOM   with green F.INS.PL   eye.INS.PL curly M.INS.PL   hair.INSTR
     'She has green eyes and curly hair'
     (Činčlej 1990:99)

However, the native speakers I have asked about have all rejected the use of *su* + Instr. in the following expression (see Appendix, 47.):

149. *Bet tai   yra   laisvi   vaikai [...]* ***Jie   *su****
     but this.N.NOM.SG   be.PRS.3 free.M.NOM.PL   child.NOM.PL They.M.NOM   with
     šviesiais   veidais,   gyvomis   akomis, *jie*
     bright.M.INS.PL   face.INS.PL vivacious M.INS.PL   eye.INS.PL they.M.NOM
     pilni   idėjų
     full.M.NOM.PL idea.GEN.PL
     'But these are free children […] **They have bright faces, vivacious eyes,** they have plenty of ideas'

Instead, they proposed to use a topicalised genitive (***jų** šviesūs veidai,* lit. 'their (are) bright faces') or an adnominal genitive (***jų** veidai šviesūs* 'their faces are bright')
It seems, that comitative constructions are accepted in these expressions, where *turėti* could also be used: in fact, with Possessees such as 'beard', 'moustache', *tureti* is usually well accepted too. On the contrary, in the cases above (148., 149.), usually it would not be used[70].

---

[70] However, four informants (out of twenty-one) have told me, they would have used *turėti* in 149. too: *jie **turi** šviesius veidus.*

5.8.5 Social Possession

In the corpus, I have found only this example of a comitative construction used to express Social Possession. This is a lexicalised expression, *būti su vaikais* 'to have children' [lit. 'to be with children']:

150. *Man,   pavyzdžai   moteriai,   kilo   įtarimas,   kad   aš*
     I.DAT   jealous.F.DAT.SG   woman.DAT.SG   come.PST.3 suspicion.NOM.SG COMP I.NOM

     *jam,   **būdama   su   dviem   mažais   vaikais,***
     he.DAT be.GER.F.NOM.SG with two.INS.PL little.M.INS.PL child.INS.PL

     atsibodau
     annoy.PST.REFL.1SG

     'Being a jealous woman, I had the suspicion that, as **I have two little children**, I bore him'

5.9 The Source schema in Belarusian and Lithuanian

The relevance of the Source schema in the expression of adnominal Possession, and its "virtual irrelevance" (Heine 1997:64), as a source for predicative possessive constructions has already been mentioned (2.5.6).

Belarusian and Lithuanian confirm Heine's claim: the Source schema fulfils a primary function in expressions of adnominal Possession (both the Lithuanian and Belarusian genitive case derive from an original Indo-European ablative), whereas it does not give birth to any possessive construction[71].

The ablative prepositions *ad* 'from' (Belarusian) and *nuo* 'from' (Lithuanian) may express part-whole relations (see examples below), but they are not very frequently used in this function. I have examined 200 occurrences of *ad* + Gen. and *nuo* + Gen., taken from the corpus, but none of them had a possessive meaning.

They are yet frequently used in combination with nouns such as 'key' or 'strings', as the corpus also has showed:

Belarusian

151. *Ključy   ad   kvatėry*
     key.NOM.PL from apartment.GEN.SG
     'the keys of the apartment'

---

[71] According to Lomtev (1956b:424), in Old Russian *ot* + Gen. could express Possession. However, the examples he furnishes testify of an ablative use of this construction, rather than of a possessive one: *Ašte li ključitsja ukrasti Rusinu otъ Grekъ čto...* 'if it happens that a Russian steals something **from a Greek**...'.

152.   *Struny ad   hitary*

string.NOM.PL from   guitar.GEN.SG

'the strings of the guitar'

Lithuanian

153.   *Raktos nuo   buto*

key.NOM.SG   from apartment.GEN.SG

'The keys of the apartment.'

154.   *Strygos nuo gitaros*

string.NOM.PL from guitar.GEN.SG

'the strings of the guitar'

In this use, both *ad* and *nuo* may be substituted with a plain Genitive: *ključy kvatery* 'apartment.GEN', 'the keys of the apartment', *buto* 'apartment.GEN' *raktos* 'id.'.

I haven't found a single case of these two preposition used in predicative position in either of the two corpora (*ključy **byli ad** kvatery* 'the keys were of the apartment'; *raktos **buvo nuo** buto* 'id.')

5.10 The Equation schema in Belarusian and Lithuanian

The Equation schema is very productive in both Belarusian and Lithuanian. It is used exclusively to express 'belonging':

Belarusian

155.   *Naša   minulae   ŭva   ŭladze   historikaŭ [...]   i   tol'ki*

our.N.NOM.SG past.NOM.SG in   power.LOC.SG historian.GEN.PL   and only

*hėty   momant –   **naš***

this.M.NOM.SG   moment.NOM.SG our.M.NOM.SG

'Our past is in the hands of historians […] and only the present moment **is ours'**

Lithuanian

156.   *Iniciatyva   **buvo   mano***

initiative.NOM.SG   be.PST.3 I.GEN

'The initiative **was mine'**

5.11 The source schemas in Belarusian and Lithuanian: a survey

The Action schema is represented in both languages. It provides Lithuanian with its major possessive strategy, the verb *turėti*, and it provides Belarusian with one of its two major strategies, the verb *mec'*. Both these verbs are typical representatives of the Action schema, as their lexical origin is to be found among verbs expressing physical control ('take', 'hold'). *Turėti* and *mec'* react

differently as far as the expression of Location (Physical Possession) is concerned: *turėti* may be used to express the meaning of 'holding in the hand' and it can be even used in expressions like 'the box has (something) written on it', whereas *mec'* cannot. Instead, Belarusian uses a locative construction ('something is written on the box') or *u* + Gen. ('at me in the hand there is something'). Both *turėti* and *mec'* can be used in locative expressions to reverse the syntactic and pragmatic roles of the Possessee and the Possessor. A sentence like "the boy has the newspaper next to him" (< "the newspaper is next to the boy") is allowed in Belarusian as well as in Lithuanian.

Both verbs – even if to different extents- are disliked *vis-à-vis* other strategies in instances of Inalienable Possession, whenever the assertion of the possessive relation is not in focus (thus, whenever the sentences is a description).

The Location schema is absent in standard Lithuanian, even if it is represented in the colloquial language through the construction *pas* + Acc.. To the contrary, the Location schema is extremely important in Belarusian, as it provides it with *u* + Gen., one of its two major strategies for the expression of Possession.

In both Lithuanian and Belarusian, the Goal schema is quite marginal for the expression of predicative internal Possession (conversely, as already mentioned (2.2), it is extremely productive for the expression of predicative external Possession). Dative possessive constructions are mainly employed in expressions, involving either a human or an abstract Possessee, such as in expressions of social relations and age[72].

At any rate, the use of the possessive dative is more frequent in Lithuanian than Belarusian. Often, to a Lithuanian dative NP corresponds in Belarusian a *u* + Gen.- phrase, as in the expression of diseases: ***Jam** gripas* ['to him flu'] versus ***U jaho** hryp* ['at him flu'] 'he has got the flu'. Alternatively, Belarusian *u* + Gen. may correspond to a Lithuanian 'topicalised genitive' (as, often, in the case physical descriptions): ***Jos** šviesūs plaukai* ['she.GEN blond hair'] versus *Valasy **ŭ jae** svetlyja*/ ***U jae** svetlyja valasy* ['hair at her blond' / 'at her blond hair'] 'she has blond hair' (see below, 5.12). In these cases, neither Belarusian nor Lithuanian like using their 'have'-verbs, *turėti* and *mec'*, and prefer instead 'be'-based constructions.

In both languages the Companion schema is much more used in expressions of adnominal Possession than in expressions of predicative Possession. However, Lithuanian employs predicative comitative constructions more than Belarusian. Lithuanian can use them to express Temporary

---

[72] Šarić (2002:19) observes, that the dative case is used in Slavic languages primarily to express intimate relationships, such as kinship relations. The dative of possession can be used to express social relations in other Indo-European languages, too. We have already seen the case of Lithuanian. In many Italian dialects, as well as in sub-standard Italian, social relations may be expressed through a dative construction: *essere amico **a qualcuno*** 'to be friend to someone → to be someone's friend'; *essere parente **a qualcuno*** "to be relative to someone → to be someone's relative'. In Gothic we also have examples of the dative used used to express kinship relations (Bauer 2000:178).

Possession, whereas Belarusian cannot. The following Lithuanian sentence is perfectly grammatical:

157. *Užpuolikas* **buvo** **su** **pistoletu**
aggressor.NOM.SG be.PST.3 with gun.INS.SG
'The aggressor **had a gun'**

On the contrary, a similar expression would not be acceptable in Belarusian:

158. ?*Napadnik* **byŭ** **z** **pistaletam**
aggressor.NOM.SG be.PST.3 with gun.INS.SG
'id'

Instead, *mec'* or *u* + Gen. with the comitative adjunct *z saboj* would be employed: ***U napadnika*** *byŭ pistalet **z saboj** // Napdnik **meŭ** pistalet **z saboj*** 'the aggressor had a gun (with him)'.
The Source schema has revealed itself practically irrelevant as a source of possessive predicative constructions. The Equation schema, on the contrary, is productive in both languages, even if only in the area of 'belonging'

	Ownership	Physical Possession	Temporary Possession	Inalienable Possession	Abstract Possession	Social Possession	Inanimate Possession
Action schema *mec'*	+	+	-	+ (with some restrictions)	+	+	+
Location schema *u* + Gen.	+	+	+	+	+	+	+ (with some restrictions)
pry	-	+	+	-	-	-	-
za + Instr.	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
Goal schema dative case	-	-	-	-	+ (in a range of lexicalised expressions)	+	-
Companion schema *z* + Instr.	(?)	+ (with *mec'* or *u* + Gen.)	-	+ (?)	-	-	+ (?)
Source schema *ad* + Gen.	-	-	-	-	-	-	+
Equation schema	+	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 7. Source schemas and possessive notions in Belarusian

	Ownership	Physical Possession	Temporary Possession	Inalienable Possession	Abstract Possession	Social Possession	Inanimate Possession
Action schema *turėti*	+	+	+	+ (with some restrictions)	+	+	+
Location schema *pas* + Acc.	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Goal schema dative case	-	-	-	+ ("little physical details")	+	+	-
Companion schema *su* + Instr.	-	+ (together with *turėti*)	+	+ (?)	+ (?)	+ (?)	+
Source schema *nuo* + Gen.	-	-	-	-	-	-	+
Equation schema	+	-	-	-	-	-	-

Tab. 8 Source schemas and possessive notions in Lithuanian

5.12 The Lithuanian 'topicalised genitive' and the Belarusian constructions like *Valasy ŭ jae byli svetlyja, Vočy ŭ jae zjalёnyja*

In the foregoing, the Lithuanian construction called 'topicalised genitive' has already been frequently mentioned. It has not been included in the exposition above, as its syntactic structure cannot be reduced to any of the schemas (maybe just to the Goal schema, from which it might have derived, as it will be showed below). This construction has rather an "intermediate" status between adnominal and predicative Possession, as it shares some properties of the one and the other type. In Belarusian, interestingly, a similar construction is found too, which is frequently used in the same contexts as the Lithuanian 'topicalised genitive'.

5.12.1 The Lithuanian 'topicalised genitive': considering Holvoet 2005and 2003a,b

The sentence presented in 159. is an instance of the 'topicalised genitive':

159. *Linos*   *buvo*   *šviesūs*   *plaukai*
      Lina.GEN   be.PST.3   blond.M.NOM.PL   hair.NOM.PL
      'Lina had blond hair' [lit. 'Lina's was blond hair']

Three elements may be distinguished: a substantive in the genitive case in topical position (*Linos* 'Lina's'), a past form of the verb *būti*, 'be' and a noun phrase, constituted by a substantive in the nominative case (*plaukai* 'hair') and its adjectival modifier (*šviesūs* 'blond').
Considering the word order, the sentence in 159. seems to correspond exactly to the English sentence *Lina's was a blond hair*. If that would be the case, 159. would be the marked variant of the neutral expression represented in 160.:

160. *Linos*   *plaukai*   *buvo*   *šviesūs*
      Lina.GEN hair.NOM.PL   be.PST.3   blond.M.NOM.PL
      'Lina's hair was blond'

Yet, 159. is used as a neutral expression, being semantically equivalent to the English sentence *Lina had blond hair* (Holvoet 2005b:154).
As far as the topic-focus roles are concerned, in 159., it is the whole Possessee-phrase 'blond hair' which is in the focus position, while the Possessor is in topical position (it is the same situation as in the English sentence *She has blond hair*). In sentence 160., on the contrary, it is only the adjective 'blond' which is in focus.
Thus, with regard to their semantics and to the distribution of the topic-focus roles, instances of the 'topicalised genitive' are much more similar to expressions of predicative Possession (as English *She has blond hair*) than to expressions of adnominal Possession. And yet, as seen above, they could be also interpreted as instances of attributive Possession with a split constituent (*Linos plaukai*).
Holvoet tries to explain this ambiguity by supposing that this construction was, originally, a dative one: *Linai* 'Lina.DAT' *šviesūs plaukai*.
He starts his analysis from the consideration that, very plausibly, Proto-Baltic employed a dative construction for the expression of predicative Possession. In Lithuanian, the original Baltic dative construction has been successively substituted by *turēti* in almost all contexts. Now, Holvoet

hypothesises that, in a first stage, the passage "'dative case > *turėti*" was successfully completed in all cases, but in those where the Possessee was determined by an adjective (as in the sentence *Linai šviesūs plaukai* 'to Lina (is) blond hair'). In fact, a characteristic of the instances of the 'topicalised genitive' is that they are grammatical only if the Possessee is modified by an adjective: **Linos buvo plaukai* would be ungrammatical.

In a second stage, the dative case, that had survived in the context "modifier-Possessee", was replaced in this context as well. Instead of being replaced by *turėti*, however, it was substituted with the genitive case[73], giving birth to the contemporary 'topicalised genitive' construction: *Linos*.GEN *šviesūs plaukai*.

The new construction has retained some properties of the one it had originated from: it expresses predicative Possession and it presents the typical word order of possessive predicative expressions (Possessor – Possessee). On the other hand, it shares with expressions of adnominal Possession the case encoding of the Possessor, the genitive:

> 'we could venture that the rise of a distinct construction should be explained as the outcome of two competing tendencies: on the one hand, the need to background the possessive relation, which, in the case of inalienable possession, is presupposed rather than asserted; and, on the other hand, the need to mark formally the possessor, rather than the possessum, as the main theme of the sentence. As we have seen, the predicative possessive construction (*Ona turėjo žalias akis* 'Ann had green eyes') puts the possessor in the position of the subject, which is prototypically reserved for the theme, but it has the drawback of serving primarily to assert a possessive relation. The copular construction with attributive possession (*Onos akys buvo žalios* 'Ann's eyes were green') presupposes possession, but it puts the possessor at once in the position of subject and theme instead of first introducing the possessor; this is also a drawback because a sentence like [*Onos buvo žalios akys* 'Ann's were green eyes', topicalised genitive, L.M.] is produced in order to give a description of a person by naming a distinguishing feature: green eyes, long hair, etc. The possessor is therefore the proper theme of the sentence. Several strategies can be used in order to reconcile both tendencies. Possessor raising[74] in a copular construction is an obvious candidate because it presupposes possession and the possessor appears an independent noun phrase, so that possessor and possessum can be differentiated in terms of thematic/rhematic structure [...] In Lithuanian, this strategy [with external Possessors in expressions like 'she has green eyes': *jai.DAT žalios akys*, L.M.] is not available, but a distinct construction has been created to perform the same task.'
> (Holvoet 2005b:65; English glosses are mine)

5.12.2 The 'topicalised genitive' in contemporary Lithuanian

In contemporary Lithuanian the 'topicalised genitive' is most frequently used in descriptions of physical characteristics, with both animate and inanimate Possessors.

---

[73] Holvoet (2005b:64) hypothesises, that the genitive was seen as the "possessive default case", and that is the reason why it has replaced the dative case in such constructions.

[74] 'Possessor raising' is called the operation, an element undertakes when it "raises" from a lower to a higher position in syntactic rank. In instances of external Possession the Possessor "raises" from being a modifier in a noun phrase to a constituent of its own: *jis bučiavo* [*jos.GEN ranką*] > [*jai.DAT*] [*ranką*] 'he kissed her hand > he kissed to her the hand'.

The following example has been proposed by native speakers[75] (see Appendix, 35.):

161. ***Mūsų   namo***   *raudonas*   *stogas*
      we.GEN   house.GEN.SG   red.M.NOM.SG   roof.NOM.SG
      'Our house has a red roof'

The topicalised genitive may also be used to express psychological states or abstract Possession, as in 162.. It may be used in descriptions, both of physical characteristics (see above) as well as of moral ones (163.):

162. ***Pagonių***   *yra*   *kitoks*   *būdas*
      heathens.GEN.PL   be.PRS.3   different.M.NOM.SG   habit.NOM.SG
      'Heathens have different habits'
      (Maskuliūnas 2000:15)

163. ***Petro***   *sunkus*   *charakteris*
      Peter.GEN   difficult.M.NOM.SG   character.NOM.SG
      'Peter has a difficult character'
      (Holvoet 2005a:153)

According to the native speakers, however, this construction cannot be used to express ownership. Senn (1929) presents the following case:

164. *Mano*   *kaimyno*   *yra*   *ilgas*   *laukas*
      I.GEN   neighbour.GEN.SG   be.PRS.3   long.M.NOM.SG   field.NOM.SG
      'My neighbour has a long field'
      (Senn 1929:24; quoted in Stassen 2009:46)

In 164. the obligatory structure with a modified Possessee is respected. However, native speakers have rejected the example proposed by Senn, and have considered it acceptable only in a contrastive context (165.):

---

[75] It must be noticed that, with a different word order, sentences with a initial genitive may be ambiguous as far as the role of the genitive constituent is concerned. A sentence like *mūsų namo stogas raudonas* may be interpreted as *[mūsų namo stogas] [raudonas]* 'the roof of our house (is) red' or as *[mūsų namo] [stogas raudonas]* 'our house is with a red roof [= has a red roof]', with a topicalised genitive (*mūsų namo*) and the adjective *raudonas* 'red' put in focus. The correct interpretation is only given by the intonation in speech.

165. | *Mano* | *kaimyno* | *yra* | *ilgas* | *laukas,* | ***o mano*** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I.GEN | neighbour.GEN.SG | be.PRS.3 | long.M.NOM.SG | field.NOM.SG | but I.GEN |

yra   trumpas

be.PRS.3 short.M.NOM.SG

'My neighbour's field is long, **whereas mine is short'**

In fact, 165. does not mean 'My neighbour has a long field'. In this meaning, only *turėti* can be used: *mano kaimynas **turi ilgą lauką*** 'id'. Rather, the meaning of 165. is a description: 'my neighbours' field **is long** (and mine is short)**'**. However, native speakers have said, that, without a contrastive context the expression would not be acceptable: **mano kaimyno ilgas laukas*. Conversely, in the case of *musų namo raudonas stogas* 'the roof of our house is red' the 'topicalised genitive' is accepted, because the Possessee is inalienable.

5.12.3 The Belarusian constructions like *Valasy ŭ jae byli svetlyja, Vočy ŭ jae zjalënyja*

In Belarusian, a construction is found that, alike that of the Lithuanian 'topicalised genitive' analyzed above, may also receive a ambiguous syntactic interpretation (Holvoet 2003a; 2005a,b). Unlike the 'topicalised genitive', however, it is not ambiguous between predicative and adnominal Possession, but is rather ambiguous between predicative and external Possession. It is exemplified in 166.:

166. | *Valasy* | ***ŭ jae*** | *byli* | *svetlyja* |
|---|---|---|---|
| hair.NOM.PL | at she.GEN | be.PST.PL | blond.NOM.PL' |

'She had blond hair'

The sentence presented in 166. may receive two interpretations. According to the first one, the *u +* Gen. phrase is considered as a normal Possessor-phrase and the adjective *svetlyja* 'blond' is understood as an adnominal modifier (therefore, *svetlyja valasy* 'blond hair' is a split constituent). The sentence thus constitutes a normal case of predicative Possession with the Possessee-phrase (or better, a part of it) which has been topicalised:

[*U jae*]$_1$ *byli* [[*svetlja*]$_2$ [*valasy*]]$_3$ > [*Valasy*]$_3$ [*u jae*]$_1$ *byli* [*svetlyja*]$_2$

According to the second interpretation, on the contrary, the *u +* Gen. phrase covers the role of an external Possessor and the adjective *svetlyja* is a predicative (Holvoet 2005b: 58):

Valasy [*u jae*] [*byli svetlyja*]

Interestingly, the condition of affectedness Haspelmath (1999) postulated for the typical European external Possessors seems appropriate to these constructions as well. Arutjunova and Širjaev (1983), with reference to Russian, state:

> 'in descriptions of body-parts this kind of nominal determination [with postnominal ambiguous *u* + Gen., L.M.] is prevalent. In Russian is much more natural to say *Glaza u neë čërnye* 'eyes at her are black' than *Glaza eë čërnye* 'her eyes are black'; *Pal'cy u neë dlinnye* 'fingers at her are long' than *Eë pal'cy dlinnye* 'her fingers are long'. The form **u neë** 'at her' is more adequate in this case because it expresses the belonging of the object to the whole, whereas the possessive adjective signals about the "object", considered almost as taken apart, belonging to the person. This difference is very clear in the next sentences: *Volosy u neë rassypalis' po plečam,* 'her hair (lit. 'hair at her') was scattered on her shoulders' and *Volosy eë (eë volosy) rassypalis' po polu,* 'her hair was scattered on the floor' (where it is spoken about cut hair)'
> (Arutjunova and Širjaev 1983:164; evidence and italics by the authors; English glosses and translation are mine)

Native speakers have confirmed that the semantic analysis Arutjunova and Širjaev proposes for Russian is valid for Belarusian too. One of them has proposed the following example:

167. *Jae   valasy   /   *u jae   zastalisja   na kanape*
      she.GEN hair.NOM.PL   at she.GEN remain.PST.PL REFL   on sofa.LOC.SG
      'Her hair was left on the sofa'

The variant *valasy ŭ jae* would be ungrammatical in this case, as it may be used exclusively in the case when the hair is still on the head of the subject (the situation described in 167. may be that of a woman who has cut her hair and has successively left it on the sofa).

This ambiguous post-nominal *u* + Gen. is frequently used in instances of Social Possession too. In this case it has an implicational meaning. In 168. the real topic of the sentence is not much the 'son', but it is rather 'she' (the mother), in reference to whom the event is presented. Therefore, the best English translation is, probably, not 'her son studies in Minsk', but, rather, 'she has a son who studies in Minsk' (see also 6.7):

168. ***Syn   u jae*** *vučycca   ŭ Minsku*
      son.NOM.SG at she.GEN study.PRS.REFL.3SG   in Minsk.LOC
      'She has a son who studies in Minsk'

A functional parallel in the use of the Lithuanian 'topicalised genitive' and the Belarusian ambiguous post-nominal *u* + Gen. may be found in the fact that both these constructions cannot be

used in expressions of Inalienable Possession, where the focus is on the assertion of the possessive relation itself, but only in descriptive ones:

__Linos__ buvo plaukai, *__Valasy u Liny__ byli*[76] 'Lina had hair' ('=she was not bold')

5.13 Competing strategies in Belarusian and Lithuanian: the case of BKI constructions

It has been said above (5.5, 5.6) that the role of the possessive dative is quite marginal in both contemporary Lithuanian and Belarusian (even if in the former, the scope of use of dative constructions is broader). However, in Belarusian, there is one context, where the dative encoding of the Possessor is, on the contrary, the preferred option: the so-called "BKI-constructions" (Rappaport 1986; about the origin of this label, see below). Even in this context, however, a certain competition between different possessive strategies may be observed. In Lithuanian BKI, conversely, the dative case represents a minor option vis-à-vis *turėti*.

The following sentences are two examples of BKI-construction:

Belarusian

169. *Mne   njama*[77]   *čaho   pic'*
     I.DAT   NEG.be.PRS.3SG what.REL.GEN drink.INF
     'I have nothing to drink'

170. *Mne   ësc'   da kaho   isci*
     I.DAT   be.PRS.3SG to who.REL.GEN go.INF
     'I have someone to go to'

Lithuanian

171. *Skubėti   tau   nėra   kur*
     hurry.INF   you.SG.DAT NEG.be.PRS.3 where
     'You have nowhere to hurry to'

172. *Jiems   yra   ką   veikti*
     they.M.DAT be.PRS.3 what.REL.ACC do.INF
     'They have something to do'

---

[76] In the case this were an instance of predicative Possession with topicalised Possessee it is yet grammatical: *U Liny byli valasy* 'Lina had hair' > *Valasy ŭ Liny byli* 'as far as the hair is concerned, she had it'.

[77] *Njama* derives from the agglutination of the negative particle *ne-* 'not' with the present stem of the verb *mec* "have": *ne mae[t'']* 'it has not' > *njama* 'there is not' (Karski 1956a:318). It must be underlined that *njama* constitutes the negative form of *ësc'* 'be.PRS' only in its existential meaning, not in the copular one: in this case *ësc'* is replaced by the negative particle *ne*.

*Jana ne   /*njama   maja žonka*
She   NEG /*NEG.be.PRS.3 my   wife
'She is not my wife'

Rappaport (1986), referring to these constructions in Russian, proposes to label them as 'BKI-constructions', from the name of their obligatory syntactic components: a form of the verb '*b*e' in the matrix clause, a *K*-word (Belarusian *što* 'what', *kto* 'who'*, kali* 'when', *dze* 'where'; Lithuanian *kas* 'what; who', *kada* 'when', *kur* 'where') and an *i*nfinitive.

Rappaport's definition reflects the Russian situation, where the matrix predicate may exclusively be 'be'. On the contrary, in Belarusian and Lithuanian the matrix predicate may also be 'have':

Belarusian

    169.a.   *Ja*   *ne*   **maju**   *čaho*   *pic'*

             I.NOM   NEG have.PRS.1SG what.REL.GEN drink.INF

             'I have nothing to drink'

    170.a.   *Ja*   **maju**   *da kaho*   *isci*

             I.NOM   have.PRS.1SG to who.REL.GEN   go.INF

             'I have someone to go to'

Lithuanian

    171.a.   *Skubėti*   *tu*   **neturi**   *kur*

             hurry.INF   you.SG.NOM   NEG.have.PRS.2SG where

             'You have nowhere to hurry to'

    172a.   *Jie*   **turi**   *ką*   *veikti*

             They.M.NOM   have.PRS.3 what. REL.ACC do.INF

             'They have something to do'

Moreover, in Belarusian (and in Russian and Ukrainian too) a *u* + Gen. phrase can take the place of the dative phrase:

169b**.**   ***U mjane***   *njama*   *čaho*   *pic'*

          At I.GEN NEG.be.PRS.3 what. REL.GEN drink.INF

          'I have nothing to drink'

Henceforth, I will refer to BKI (sentences with no overt agent) – like Lithuanian ***yra***.'is' *kur eiti* 'there is where to go', DBKI - Dative BKI, like Lithuanian ***man* '**I.DAT' *yra kur eiti* 'I have where to go'-, HKI - 'have'KI, like Lithuanian ***turiu.***'have.1SG' *kur eiti* 'I have where to go' – and, finally, UBKI – *u* + Gen. BKI, like Belarusian ***u mjane*** *njama čaho pic'* 'I have nothing to drink'.

As the English glosses show, all these sentences can be considered as possessive expressions (except, of course, for BKI, which are existential).

DBKI represent an instance of the Goal schema, where the Dative NP is the Possessor and the K-word the Possessee[78]:

PR [Dative NP] PRED ['be'.EXIST] PE [Nominative NP]

Mne   ësc'   što   pic'

'I have something to drink'

It is beyond the interest of this work to describe in detail the grammaticalization path of DBKI. However, it can be said that they have originated in the period when dative constructions were the main option for the expression of Possession in both Baltic and Slavic. UBKI and HKI have probably arisen later, when the possessive dative has been replaced in this function by either *u* + Gen. or 'have' (Jung 2010, Holvoet 1999).

HKI constructions are attested in Old Church Slavonic (Vaillant 1977:209), as well as in all modern Slavic languages, with the obvious exception of Russian. DBKI, to the contrary, are not attested in Old Church Slavonic. In the Southern Slavic languages they are also not used. In Western Slavic, DBKI are still used in Polish[79], whereas they are not used in Czech and Slovak[80].

In East Slavic, UBKI are attested from the 14th century (Jung 2010:392). Russian has both UBKI and DBKI, but it lacks HKI. Therefore, Belarusian and Ukrainian are the only Slavic languages[81] in which DBKI, UBKI and HKI co-exist and, to a certain extent, compete.

Lithuanian still has the old DBKI, together with the innovative HKI; it obviously doesn't have UBKI.

In Belarusian DBKI, HKI and UBKI are only partially synonymous[82]. Their frequency of use is also highly differentiated. The results of the corpus analysis have shown that negative DBKI are the most frequent type: over fifty occurrences of them have been found, both in the present and in the past tense. Affirmative DBKI are less frequent (around twenty occurrences).

---

[78] This interpretation is defended, *inter alia*, in Garde (1976), Rappaport (1986), Holvoet (1999, 2001b, 2003b). They consider the dative NP as being both a constituent of the matrix clause, bearing the role of subject, and the subject of the infinitival clause. Therefore, the matrix clause assumes the typical aspect of instances of the Goal schema, as shown above. A opposite interpretation is given in Jung (2010). Jung claims that the dative NP does not bear the role of the matrix subject, but it is only the subject of infinitival clause. Therefore, she does not consider DBKI as possessive expressions, but she ascribes a possessive meaning only to UBKI.

[79] In Polish DBKI are still in use, but to a much lesser extent than HBKI and are considered as belonging to the colloquial register (L. Gebert, p.c.):

a. *nie ma   **mi**   z   kim   pić* // ***nie mam***   z   kim   *pić*
   NEG have.PRS.3SG I.DAT with who..REL.INS drink.INF   NEG have.PRS.1SG   with who.REL.INS drink.INF
   'I have no-one to drink with'

[80] I could not find any references about Sorbian.

[81] Probably, Rusyn (at least in its Ukrainian variant) has DBKI, UBKI and HKI as well. However, unfortunately, I could not find any references about this.

[82] Native speakers of Ukrainian have told me that in this language slight semantic differences among DBKI, HKI and UBKI exist as well.

In the whole corpus, conversely, only seven occurrences of HKI, four affirmative and three negative, and three occurrences of UBKI, one negative and two affirmative, have been found:

173. *Ty*   *ž*   *chacja* **maeš**   *da kaho*   *isci*
    You.SG.NOM   PART though have.PRS.2SG to who.REL.GEN go.INF
    'At least you have someone to go to'

174. *Taja*   *ž*   *moladz'*   **nja mae**   *dze*   *prytyknucca*
    This.F.NOM.SG PART youth.NOM.SG   NEG have.PRS.3SG where squeeze_in.INF.REFL
    'This youth, on the contrary, has no place to squeeze in'

175. **U heolahaŭ**   *bylo*   *čym*   *pažyvicca*
    at geolog.GEN.PL   be.PST.N.SG what.REL.INS   eat.INF
    'The geologists had something to eat'

176. **U mjane**   *ësc'*   *što*   *skazac'*   *dlja druku*
    at I.GEN   be.PRS.3.   what..REL.ACC say.INF   for press.GEN.SG
    'I have what to say to the press'

177. **U majho**   **znaëmaha**   *ne*   *bylo*   *čaho*   *kinuc'*   *u*
    at my.M.GEN.SG   acquientance.GEN.SG   NEG be.PAST.N.SG what.REL.GEN   throw.INF in
    polymja
    flame.ACC.SG
    'My acquientance had nothing to throw into the flames'

As said above, DBKI, HKI and UBKI are not completely synonymous. The following examples have been presented to native speakers, asking them which variant they would prefer:

178. a. **Mne**   *njama*   *čaho*   *pic'*
    I.DAT   NEG.be.PRS.3   what.REL.GEN drink.INF
    'He has nothing to drink'

    b**.** **U mjane**   *njama*   *čaho*   *pic'*
    at I.GEN   NEG.be.PRS.3   what.REL.GEN drink.INF
    'id.'

179. a**.** **Jamu**   *njama*   *z*   *kim*   *vypic'*
    I.DAT   NEG.be.PRS.3   with who.REL.INS drink.INF
    'He has nobody to have a drink with'

    b. **U jaho** *njama*   *z*   *kim*   *vypic'*
    at I.GEN NEG.be.PRS.3   with who.REL.INS drink.INF
    'id.'

All informants considered acceptable both the variants (178a. e b.) of the first sentence, an instance of Temporary Possession. However, they have pointed out a difference in meaning between them. In 178b. (UBKI) the speaker communicates the fact that in that moment, in his/her possession there is nothing s/he can drink or s/he can offer to someone to drink. Most informants have considered 178b. grammatical only when understood as an answer to a question: 'Do you have (here, now) something to drink?' 'No, I have (here, now) nothing to drink'. It seems that, in such cases, the meaning of the *u* + Gen.-phrase is on the very edge between Temporary Possession and Location: 'now at me – in my home – there is nothing I can offer you to drink'.

On the contrary, in 178a. (DBKI) the speaker communicates his/her impossibility to drink (due to lack of anything drinkable). The meaning seems to be somehow more "abstract" than in the previous sentence: unlike in the latter, here the speaker does not focus on the absence of something drinkable, but on the fact the s/he *cannot* drink.

Native speakers have rejected the UBKI in 179b., accepting only the variant with the dative case (179a.): *u* + Gen. is decidedly disliked when the relation is abstract (see Appendix, 21.).

Rappaport (1986:23), with reference to Russian, writes that "in the contemporary language, the Dative is more abstract, indicating less actual possession than potential relation". His claim seems to be valid also in Belarusian, as shown above.

Actually, some occurrences of *u* + Gen. to express abstract relations can be found as well (as in the example quoted above from the corpus, 175.), but they are quite rare. On the Internet, I have found just two such occurrences, both of which come from the same text, a novel by Maisej Sjadnëŭ:

180. *Dyk **u cjabe*** *njama* **ab** **čym** **i** ***havaryc'*** *sa* *mnoju?*
so at you.SG.GEN NEG.be.PRS.3 about what.REL.LOC and talk.INF with I.INS
'So you **haven't anything to talk about** with me?'
(M. Sjadnëŭ, *Raman Korzjuk*, 1985)

HKI seem to be used to express both relations of real Possession (either Temporary Possession or ownership) and more abstract ones:

181. *Ty* *ž* *chacja* ***maeš*** *da kaho* *isci*
You.SG.NOM PART though have.PRS.2SG to who.REL.GEN go.INF
'At least you have someone to go to'

182. ***Nja*** ***maju*** *ab* *čym* *škadavac'*
NEG have.PRS.1SG about what.REL.INS complain.INF
'I have nothing to complain about'
(http://suziralnik.livejournal.com/26685.html)

183. *Tut zausëdy **maeš**   dze   pažyc'*
    here always have.PRS.2SG where live.INF
    'Here you will always have somewhere to live'
    (from an e-mail)

However, some native speakers have considered even the following example, though grammatical, in someway unnatural, and they have proposed instead the DBKI variant:

184. *?**Ne**   **maju**   čaho   pic'*
    NEG   have.PRS.1SG what.REL.ACC drink.INF
    'I have nothing to drink'

As for Lithuanian, the corpus analysis has showed that HKI are much more frequent that DBKI: over three hundred occurrences of HKI and just a little more than forty occurrences of DBKI have been found. Unlike in Belarusian, it seems that in Lithuanian there are no semantic differences between the two constructions. Native speakers did not notice any difference in meaning between 185a. and 185b., as well as between 186a. and 186b:

185. a. *Čia   **neturiu**   ką   veikti*
        here   NEG.have.PRS.1SG what.REL.ACC do.INF
        'Here I have nothing to do'
    .b *Čia   **man**   nėra   ką   veikti*
        here I.DAT   NEG.be.PRS.3 what..RELACC   do.INF
        'id.'
186. a. *Čia   **neturiu**   su   kuo   pasikalbėti*
        here NEG.have.PRS.1SG with who.REL.INSTR chat.INF.REFL
        'Here I have no one to have a chat with'
    b. *Čia   **man**   nėra   su   kuo   pasikalbėti*
        here   I.DAT   NEG.be.PRS.3 with who.REL.INSTR chat.INF
        'id.'

That is also confirmed by the corpus data. I have found two examples where the same situation is described once with a HKI and once with a DBKI:

187. *Kaimynui   Zigmui   nuobodu -   **neturi**   su   kuo*
    neighbour.DAT.SG Zigmas.DAT boring.N.NOM.SG –   NEG.have.PRS.3SG with who.REL.INS

pasišnekėti

chat.INF.REFL

'(Our) neighbour Zigmas bothers himself – **he has nobody to chat with**'

188. *Tik   pasišnekėti   **jam**   nėra   su   kuo*

only chat.INF.REFL   he.DAT   NEG.be.PRS.3   with who. REL.INS

'Only, **he has nobody to chat with**'

It could be conjectured, as to why Belarusian and Lithuanian have retained DBKI even after the arising of UBKI and HKI.

A possible explanation may be found in the semantics of the dative case, which, in both languages, is used to encode Beneficiaries.

In Lithuanian the dative case is the only option for this role: *Ši dovana yra **Jonui*** 'This gift is **for Jonas'** [lit. '**to Jonas'**]. In Belarusian Beneficiaries may be encoded either with the dative case or with the preposition *dlja,* 'for', + Gen.:

189. *Ja kupiŭ   **tabe**   //   **dlja cjabe**   hėty   padarunak*

I   buy.PST.M.SG. you.SG.DAT for you.SG.GEN this.M.ACC.SG gift.ACC.SG

'I bought **you** // **for you** this gift'

In this regard DBKI are highly ambiguous. Together with the possessive reading, a certain benefactive reading is possible as well ('I have nothing to eat' - 'there is nothing **for me** to eat', Rappaport 1986: 23). This ambiguous semantic role of the Dative NP, oscillating between an abstract Possessor and a Beneficiary, might have contributed to prevent the extinction of DBKI after the arising of HKI and UBKI.

It could also be ventured, that in Belarusian HKI have not developed as much as an Lithuanian because the fact of having a 'be'-based major possessive construction (*u* + Gen.) has helped in retaining the 'be'-structure in the context of BKI-constructions as well: therefore, in Belarusian DBKI have prospered, whereas in Lithuanian, they have mostly been substituted with HKI[83].

6.14 Remarks about the expression of Possession in Old Lithuanian and in Old Belarusian

At last, it is worth to spend a word about Old Lithuanian and Old Belarusian. Here they have not been taken into consideration, since the primary goal of this work is to describe the encoding of

---

[83] It must also be remarked that in East Slavic (Russian, Ukrainian, Belarusian) and in Lithuanian the dative case has retained more of its older modal functions than in the other Slavic languages (Holvoet 2003b). Therefore, it is not so surprising that DBKI have prospered more in these languages.

Possession in Belarusian and Lithuanian from a synchronic point of view, and a diachronic analysis would have gone beyond its possibilities. Moreover, the topic of the reliability of Old Belarusian and Old Lithuanian texts as sources of information about the real state of the language at that time and about the development of syntactic constructions in the history of these two languages is too complex to be addressed here.

However, it can be said that, in general, the means of expression of Possession in contemporary Lithuanian and Belarusian do not differ much from the ones used in the old language.

In Old Lithuanian *turėti* was already the major strategy, while possessive dative constructions were by now rarely used (Maskuliūnas 2000). Sporadically, locative possessive constructions with the adessive case, nowadays extinct in the standard language, were used as well (*ibid*.).

In Old Belarusian both *mec'* and *u* + Gen. were used[84] (Karski 1956a:443). Occasionally, dative possessive constructions might appear as well, mostly in expressions like *beda **mne*** 'I am in trouble' [lit. 'misfortune is me.DAT'], or *imja **emu*** 'his name (is)..' [lit. 'name him.DAT'] (Karski 1956a:414).

---

[84] I could not find any works about the competition of *mec'* – *u* + Gen. in Old Belarusian.

Chapter 6. Belarusian and Lithuanian 'have'

This chapter is dedicated to a further analysis of the functions of the verbs *mec'* and *turėti* in contemporary Belarusian and Lithuanian.

First, an analysis of the contexts, where these two verbs are disliked, or not used at all, will be made. Then, the non-possessive functions these two verbs may fulfil will be presented. Finally, Belarusian and Lithuanian 'have' will be compared with the 'have'-verbs of the other languages of the area.

6.1 *Mec'* and *u* + Gen. as competing strategies in Belarusian

In the previous chapter, it has been showed that *mec'* and *u* + Gen. are the two major possessive constructions that Belarusian can dispose of. However, they are not always interchangeable the one with another. As seen above (5.3.2.4), *u* + Gen. is more disliked, *vis-à-vis mec'*, in instances of Inanimate Possession, when they imply inclusion, as in *the house has three rooms*. In its turn, *mec'* is disliked *vis-à-vis u* + Gen. in the expression of Inalienable Possession (descriptions; 5.1.5). The analysis will now focus on the contexts where the usage of *mec'* is ungrammatical, or where *u* + Gen. is usually preferred.

6.1.1 Restrictions on the use of *mec'*

According to both the corpus analysis and the judgements of native speakers, these contexts are:

Abstract Possession

a. With Possessee NPs denoting a disease;
b. With Possessee NPs such as 'trouble', 'nostalgia';

Inalienable Possession
c. Descriptive instances of Inalienable Possession (such as *She had blue eyes*)

a. Diseases

All informants without exception have defined *mec'* ungrammatical, in the cases when the Possessee NP denotes a disease. The corpus analysis and a research on the Internet have also confirmed their statement:

190. **U Jana**   *hryp //*   ****Jan***   **mae**   *hryp*
      At Jan.GEN flu.NOM.SG Jan.NOM have.PRS.3SG flu.ACC.SG
      'Jan **has got a flu'** (own data)

On the contrary, *mec'* is well accepted when the Possessee denotes a symptom of a disease (191.):

191. *Jan* **mae**   *vysokuju*   *temperaturu   dyj inšyja*   *symptomy*
      Jan have.PRS.3SG high.F.ACC.SG fever.ACC.SG   and other.ACC.PL symptom.ACC.PL
      hrypa //   **U Jana**   *vysokaja*   *temperatura*   *dyj*   *inšyja*
      flu.GEN.SG At Jan.GEN high.F.NOM.SG   temperature.NOM.SG and   other.NOM.PL
      symptomy   *hrypa*
      symptoms.NOM.PL flu.GEN
      'Jan has high fever and other symptoms of flu'

b. NPs such as 'happiness', 'nostalgia', etc.

Most native speakers have strongly disliked *mec'* (and some of them have even considered it ungrammatical) when the Possessee NP denotes a "psycho-social" condition or a feeling, such as 'trouble', 'nostalgia' (see Krivickij and Padlužnyj 1994:220ff.; see Appendix, 15.):

192. **Ja*   **maju**   *bjadu*   *//* **U mjane**   *bjada*
      I.NOM   have.PRS.1SG misfortune.ACC.SG   At I.GEN   misfortune.NOM.SG
      'I am in trouble'

193. *?Ja* **maju**   *vjaliki*   **sum**   *pa radzime*
      I have.PRS.1SG   great..M.ACC.SG   nostalgia.ACC.SG for homeland.LOC.SG
      U mjane   *vjaliki*   **sum**   *pa radzime*
      at I.GEN   great..M.NOM.SG nostalgia.NOM for homeland.LOC.SG
       'I am homesick'

c. Inalienable Possession

Some native speakers have disliked *mec'* in descriptive instances of Inalienable Possession, such as the following sentence: (Appendix, 11.):

194. *?Ën*   **meŭ**   *maladyja*   *i dobryja*   *vočy*
      he.NOM   have.PST.M.SG young.NOM.PL and good.NOM.PL eye.ACC.PL
      'He had young and good eyes'

It must be said, however, that in the field of physical descriptions native speakers have given considerably different judgments. Some informants have accepted *mec'* in this context without hesitation and have judged it perfectly natural.

All native speakers have accepted *mec'* in the following sentence (see Appendix, 9.):

195. *Typovy*   *Belarus*   **mae**   **blakitnyja**   **abo**
typical.M.NOM.SG   Belarusian.NOM.SG   have.PRS.3SG   light-blue.ACC.PL   or

šeryja vočy
grey.ACC.PL eyes.ACC.PL

'The typical Belarusian **has light-blue or grey eyes**'

Maybe, this sentence is more accepted as it states a general characteristic of a given group of persons (the Belarusians), and it is not really a physical description. However, it might also be the reason of the dislike of mec' in the first sentence was the qualification the 'eyes' have received ("young and good" instead of "blue").

At any rate, the results of the corpus analysis confirm the dislike of *mec'* in such contexts (see 5.1.5). Except for the following example and the sentence quoted above in 39., all occurrences of physical descriptions which I have found in the corpus presented *u* + Gen. Even in this case; however, 'voice' is a Possessee that can be easily considered as an abstract possession, and not as an inalienable item:

196. *S'pjavak*   **mae**   **mahutny,**   **charyzmatyčny [...]**
singer.NOM.SG   have.PRS.3SG   powerful.M.ACC.SG   charistmatic.M.ACC.SG

holas
voice.ACC.SG

'The singer **has a powerful, charismatic [...] voice**'

On the contrary, *mec'* is always accepted when the main informative purpose of the sentence is not to describe the physical aspect of a person, but it is rather to assert that s/he has a given possession (even if it is an inalienably possessed item):

197. *Toj,*   **chto**   **mae**   **vočy**   **i**   **vušy,**   *meŭ*
that.M.NOM.SG   who.REL.NOM have.PRS.3SG   eye.ACC.PL and ear.ACC.PL   have.PST.M.SG

use   *mahčimas'ci*   *ŭbačyc',*   *pačuc'*   *i*   *acanic'*
all.ACC.PL   possibility.ACC.PL   see.INF   hear.INF   and   judge.INF

'He, who **has eyes and ears**, had all the possibilities to see, to hear and to judge'

It has already been shown (5.1.5 and 5.2.6.), that the opposition between instances of Inalienable Possession where the focus falls on the verb (and, therefore, on the assertion of the possessive relation: *he has eyes* is a appropriate answer to the question 'what does he have?') and instances where the focus is rather on the particular qualification of the Possessee (and are, therefore, descriptive: *he has blue eyes* is a appropriate answer to the question 'how are his eyes?', and, indirectly, to the question 'how does he look like?'; see Činčlej 1990:79-80) is crucial in Belarusian (and, as it will be shown below, in Lithuanian as well). This opposition has consequences on the selection of *u* + Gen. as the preferred strategy, as seen above, and it has also consequences on the covert/overt status of the predicate *ësc'* '(there) is' in the construction *u* + Gen. (5.3.2.5).

6.1.2 *Mec'* versus *u* + Gen.: non-semantic factors

It has already been said, that the judgments of Belarusian native speakers about the (un)grammaticality or (un)acceptability of *mec'* in the contexts presented above vary considerably, most of all in the field of physical descriptions: Some informants have accepted *mec'*, while others have not.

This variety in the answers native speakers have given may be explained with reference to different factors.

First of all, a certain variation is physiological: *mec'*, in fact, is not ungrammatical in these contexts, but just disliked (but for the case of diseases, where all informants have agreed about the impossibility of using *mec'*).

The linguistic competence of the informants might have played a role as well. As already said, I have avoided interviewing "newly-converted" speakers, and, in general, I have tried to interview native speakers, who have grown up in Belarusian-speaking families. However, some of my informants have actually grown up in Russian-speaking families, and, therefore, a certain influence of Russian might have influenced their judgements. It might have been the case that some informants have preferred to use *u* + Gen. not because of semantic motivations, but because of the influence of Russian, which is their actual mother tongue.

The fact of having begun to use daily Belarusian in adult age might have also caused in some informants a certain tendency to "hypercorrection" in favour of *mec'*. *Mec'*, moreover, has the symbolic status of "real Belarusian construction", *vis-à-vis* the "Russian" *u* + Gen.. The present socio-linguistic situation in Belarus' (see above, 3.4.2) has caused two equal and opposite processes to take place. On the one hand, Belarusian has been heavily Russificated. On the other hand, puristic tendencies have arisen, which aim to 'eliminate' "Russian" elements from Belarusian and to

substitute them with "real" Belarusian ones. Usually, the latter elements are identified with the elements Belarusian shares with Polish (and, sometimes, this puristic fervour has even resulted into introducing artificial Polonisms in Belarusian, most of all in the *taraškevica*, Žuraŭski 1998, see 3.4.2.2).

The contrast "*u* + Gen. versus *mec'*" is a perfect example of this opposition: *u* + Gen. is a construction that is also present in Russian, *mec'* also in Polish. Therefore, native speakers may have been particularly inclined to interpret the competition *u* + Gen. versus *mec'* not only on the basis of their actual linguistic competence and practice, but also (or even more) on the basis of what they believe being the "most Belarusian" form. Some native speakers might have accepted *mec'* even in cases they would not really use it in that given context just because *mec'* represents an "anti-Russian" (and thus a "real Belarusian") construction.

Finally, the dislike of *mec'* in the contexts presented above might also be ascribed *tout court* to the influence of Russian, that has contributed to strengthen the functions of *u* + Gen. at the expense of *mec'*. If so, the competition between the two strategies should not be seen in terms of semantic properties of *mec'* but in terms of language contact (speakers of Belarusian have begun to use *u* + Gen. more and more because of the external model set by Russian).

It seems to me, however, that, even if all these factors must be taken into account[85], the competition *mec'* – *u* + Gen. in the aforementioned contexts should be considered as being primarily semantically motivated. In fact, the native speakers with a better competence in Belarusian have all agreed on disliking *mec'* in these contexts. Moreover, even if a certain influence from Russian (both on the level of individual speakers and on the level of the language in its whole) is surely present, if the "weakness" of *mec'* vis-à-vis *u* + Gen. were due only to language contact, it would be always present, in all contexts[86]. To the contrary, the fact that *mec'* is particularly disliked only in specific contexts suggests a primarily semantic, intra-Belarusian motivation (even if, as it will be seen below, areal influences have surely played a considerable role).

---

[85] The use of *mec'* seems to be, moreover, highly differentiated in the different Belarusian dialects. Many speakers have told me that they would not use *mec'* in one of the contexts exposed above, but they have also added, that, in their opinion, in Western Belarus' this form would be accepted. This statement seems to be valid. In fact, Western Belarus' neighbours the area where Polish and Lithuanian, two languages which make a greater use of 'have' than Belarusian, are spoken, and an areal influence might be invoked to explain why *mec'* is more used.

[86] And, in fact, I have observed a certain preference towards the use of *u* + Gen. in the linguistic behaviour of some Belarusians: they use *mec'* far more rarely than *u* + Gen., in all contexts. Probably, in this case, Russian influence, or a scarce knowledge of Belarusian, can be invoked to explain their behaviour.

6.2 Restrictions on the use of *turėti*

Even if *turėti* has no rivals for the role of major possessive notion in Lithuanian it is nevertheless disliked in some particular contexts, which are, interestingly, almost the same in which *mec'* is disliked too:

Abstract Possession

a. With Possessee NPs denoting a disease;

Inalienable Possession

b. Descriptive instances of Inalienable Possession

a.Diseases

As already seen above, *turėti* may be disliked when the Possessee NP denotes a disease: **turiu gripą* 'I have flu', and, instead of *turėti*, a dative adjunct would be used: *man*.DAT *gripas* 'I have got the flue' [lit. 'to me the flue']. Unlike in the case of *mec'*, however, some substantives denoting diseases, like *sloga* 'cold' or *vėžys* 'cancer', accept *turėti* (Činčlej 1990:66)

b. Descriptive instances of Inalienable Possession

Just like *mec'*, *turėti* is decidedly disliked in descriptions of physical characteristics, where it is generally substituted by a topicalised genitive (or, even if rarely, by a comitative/Instrumental construction (see above, 5.8.4). Conversely, *turėti* is generally well accepted in assertive expressions of Inalienable Possession, where Belarusian uses *mec'* or *u* + Gen. with overt 'be', as in 198.:

198. | ***Turi*** | ***akis*** | *ir nemato,* | ***turi*** | ***ausis*** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| have.PRS.3 | eye.ACC.PL | and NEG.see.PRS.3 | have.PRS.3. | ear.ACC.PL |

   ir negirdi
   and NEG.hear.PRS.3
   'They **have eyes**, but do not see, they **have ears**, but do not hear' (Ps 115, 5-6)

199. | *Pirmas* | *jo* | *klausimas* | *buvo,* | *kaip aš* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| first.M.NOM.SG | he.GEN | question.NOM.SG | be.PAST.3SG | how I.NOM |

atrodžiau	*suėmimo*	*metu.*	***Ar***	***turėjau,***	***barzdą,***
look_like.PST.1SG	arrest.GEN.SG	time.INS.SG	Q	have.PST.1SG	beard.ACC.SG

ūsus?

moustache.ACC.PL

'His first question was how did I look like at the time of the arrest. **Did I have a**

beard, a moustache?'

At this regard, Činčlej states, that "in Lithuanian *turėti* shows the tendency of appearing in the sentences where the possessive relation is in focus (that relates, first of all, to the relation of ownership), i.e. where Russian uses the copula *est'"*(Činčlej 1990:98; my translation). It is worth mentioning the fact that the same statement often applies to Belarusian *mec'*: it also shows the tendency of occurring in the same cotexts where *ësc'* would be overt (instances of Inalienable Possession where the possessive relation is in focus, for instance).

Interestingly, all the elements mentioned above depict a picture of *turėti* as opposing to the 'topicalised genitive'. In fact, the latter, unlike *turėti*, can be exclusively used in descriptive instances of Inalienable Possession:

*jo	*nebėra*	*plaukų*	versus	*jis*	***nebeturi***	*plaukų*
he.GEN.	NEG.still.be.PRS.3	hair.GEN.PL		he.NOM	NEG.still.have.PRS.3	hair.GEN.PL

'He has his hair no more (he has become bold)'

jos	*žalios*	*akys*	versus	*(*)ji*	***turi***	*žalias*	*akis*
she.GEN	green.F.NOM.PL	eye.NOM.PL		she.NOM	have.PRS.3SG	green.F.ACC.PL	eye.ACC.PL

'She has green eyes'

It is also worth remarking that in descriptions of moral characteristics both Lithuanian and Belarusian can use their 'have'-verbs, but can also use their 'be'-based constructions: ***U jaho*** *cjažki charaktar / **jo** sunkus charakteris* 'he has a difficult character'.

6.3. Restrictions on the use of *turėti* and *mec'*: an attempt at an explanation

I suggest that the dislike of *mec'* and *turėti* in the aforementioned cases might be effectively explained with reference to the "experiencer-like" or "passive" role of the Possessor

In the expressions examined above, in fact, the Possessor is fairly "passive" with relation to the possibility of starting/ending the possessive relation: evidently, no-one can voluntarily choose to suffer or to recover from an illness, to feel or to stop feeling *nostalgia*, to be or not to be *in trouble,*

to be *blue-* or *brown-eyed*, whereas one can usually choose to have or to stop having *a house* or *a car*.

In some of the expressions examined here (as in the case of diseases, or psychological states in Belarusian) the Possessor can be described as an experiencer. Haspelmath (2001:1945-6) claims that Eastern European languages prefer to encode experiencers as patients or goals – in syntactic terms, as a direct object or as a dative –, whereas Western European languages usually prefer to encode them as nominative agents: Belarusian *hėta* 'this' **mne** 'me.DAT' *padabaecca* 'like.REFL.3SG' 'I like it' versus English *I like it*. Lithuanian shows also a tendency towards the use of non-nominative subjects, even if to a smaller extent with respect to Russian (and Belarusian; *ibid*.:map). As far as the example provided above is concerned, in Lithuanian both a nominative construction with the verb *mėgti* 'like' and a non-nominative construction exist: *aš megstu* ['I like'] 'I like' vs *man patinka* ['to me (it) likes'] = I like'.

Haspelmath states also, that "if 'have'-verbs turn out to be typical of Europe, that would fit with the tendency of European languages to have nominative experiencers in experiential verbs" (*ibid*.:1495). Now, the typological research does not give us much support to say that 'have'-verbs are a prerogative of European languages (Stassen 2009, Heine 1997), but it is sure that 'have'-verbs enjoy a major diffusion in Europe, at least in its South-Western part (Stassen 2009:247; Haspelmath 2001:1495). Conversely, as already said, 'have'-verbs are either absent or only marginally used in most Eastern European languages (both Indo-European and Ugro-Finnic) : Latvian and Finnish lack a 'have'-verb, while Russian, though it has the have-verb, uses it only marginally, preferring instead the locative construction *u* 'at' + Gen. The fact that Belarusian and Lithuanian, though disposing of a 'have'-verb, do not preferably use it in experiential situations (such as the expression of diseases) fits with the tendency of these languages of encoding experiencers not as nominative agents (***ja maju hryp**, I have flu), but rather as dative goals, or, as in the case of Belarusian, locative Possessors (**u mjane** *hryp*, at me flu = 'I have the flu').

One could also think, that Lithuanian and Belarusian simply do not like to describe "how one looks like" (physical characteristics), "how one is" (moral characteristics) or "what one is affected by" (diseases, feelings) in terms of Possession. However, this claim does not correspond to the linguistic facts. Both Lithuanian and Belarusian, in fact, may use possessive constructions to express physical characteristics (topicalised genitive, *u* + Gen.), moral characteristics (*turėti, u* + Gen.), diseases and feelings (*u* + Gen., dative case – even if this is ambiguous between a possessive and a pure experiential meaning). Therefore, Lithuanian and Belarusian do linguistically represent these situations in terms of Possession. Only, they do not like to use 'have' to express them, preferring instead other, 'be'-based, constructions.

6.4 'Have' as a temporal and modal auxiliary in Belarusian and Lithuanian

The grammaticalization of 'have'-verbs into modal and temporal (future[87]) auxiliaries is a well-known phenomenon; cross-linguistically quite widespread (Bybee *et al*. 1994:253ff). Both Belarusian *mec'* and Lithuanian *turėti* have auxiliary functions for the expression of modality and, limitedly to *mec'*, of future tense.

6.4.1 *Mec'* as semi-temporal and modal auxiliary in Belarusian

The verb 'have' functioned as an auxiliary in Slavic probably since the Late Common Slavic period (Andersen 2006). *Iměti* 'have' is attested in Old Church Slavonic as an auxiliary expressing modality (necessity) and future tense (Hansen 2001:260ff.). According to Hansen (2003), in East Common Slavic *iměti* had "a purely deontic modal meaning and a second meaning oscillating between modality and future. The latter function can be called 'destinative future'" (*ibid*: 110).

In Old Belarusian (14th to 18th century) 'have' functioned as a modal auxiliary too, expressing a strong deontic obligation; it also had a temporal-modal auxiliary function, expressing 'fatalistic', or 'destinative', future and a form of 'scheduled' future (Mazzitelli 2011:186ff.). It had, moreover, some other functions, disappeared in the contemporary language, which might also be ascribed to a semantic calque from Old Polish *mieć*: for instance, the possibility of expressing reported speech in clauses depending on locutionary verbs (*ibid*.; see Hansen 2001:371ff. about the functions of Old Polish *mieć*).

In contemporary Belarusian, the auxiliary use of *mec'* (henceforth, *mec'* in this function will be designed as *mec'* + Inf.) is relatively rare. As far as I could verify, it has been surprisingly ignored in scientific investigation: most grammars, even the *Belaruskaja hramatyka* (1986)*,* which is the normative grammar for the contemporary *narkaŭmaka*-standard, does not mention it[88].

Andersen (2006) mentions it only briefly: "[in Belarusian] here and there the similarly obsolete *maju* + Inf. has been recorded; it is difficult to separate its future sense from its modal reference" (*ibid*.:29).

Lomtev (1956a), underlying the rarity of its use, defines *mec'* + Inf. as a 'dialecticism':

> 'in the literary language the use of the auxiliary verb *maju* [*mec'*, L.M.] can be observed […].
> Here [in the construction *mec'* + Inf., L.M.] we have not only the meaning of future tense, but a

---

[87] Bybee *et al*. (1994:263) hypothesize that this meaning does not directly derive from the possessive one. Rather, it derives from the obligation meaning, through an "intention step": Possession → Obligation → Intention → Future.
An alternative pathway, testified in some languages, eludes the obligation step and replaces it with a 'predestination step': Possession → Predestination → Intention → Future.

[88] *Mec'* is not mentioned as a modal auxiliary in Besters-Dilger, Drobnjakovič and Hansen (2009:173) either. It must be said, that in this otherwise complete work the modal adverb *treba* 'necessary' is also omitted in the list of Belarusian modals.

certain semantic nuance, which goes beyond the limits of tense. Such constructions must be considered, in contemporary standard Belarusian, as dialecticisms.'
(Lomtev 1956a:181; my translation)

The corpus analysis has confirmed the rarity of this construction. In the corpus only 78 occurrences (0,05 per thousand words) of *mec'* + Inf. have been found, mainly in journalistic prose. The chosen standard seems to represents a determinant factor: *mec'* + Inf. is much more common in the *taraškevica* standard than in the *narkamaŭka* one, where it is practically never found[89].

The paradigm of *mec'* + Inf. is quite reduced. Most occurrences are in the indicative mood, one is a conditional and four are participles, used as adjectives: **majučae** 'have'.PPA.N.NOM.SG **adbycca**. 'take place'.INF.REFL *svjata* 'party'.NOM.SG 'the party **that will/has to take place'**. Remarkably, almost all occurrences found in the corpus are in the third person, both singular and plural (see tab.9). There are no restrictions on the aspectual from of the infinitive, governed by *mec'*: both perfectives and imperfectives are allowed.

Mood and tense	Occurrences
Present indicative	58
Past indicative	15
Conditional	1
Future indicative, imperative, gerund	No occurrences
Participles	4
Person	
3SG / 3PL	73
2PL	1
1SG/1PL; 2SG	No occurrences

Tab. 9 Occurrences of *mec'* + Inf. in the corpus

The analysis of the occurrences of *mec'* + Inf. found in the corpus has shown that this construction can be used to express several notions, all on the edge between temporality (future tense) and modality (deontic necessity).

---

[89] The example of the newspaper *Naša Niva* provides striking evidence of this. The newspaper was edited in *taraškevica* until 2008, when it switched to *narkamaŭka*. In the corpus, texts from both versions of the newspaper are included. The analysis has shown that in the texts taken from the *taraškevica* version of *Naša Niva mec'* + Inf. is relatively very frequent (51 occurrences, almost three-third of all the occurrences found in the corpus). In the texts taken from the *narkamaŭka* version of the newspaper, conversely, only two occurrences of *mec'* + Inf. have been found.
The higher frequency of *mec'* + Inf. in the *taraškevica* standard is probably a consequence of the more 'Western Belarusian' and definitely anti-Russian character of *taraškevica* standard. In the Soviet literature the construction *mec'* + Inf. is totally absent, while it is frequently used by the writers in the emigration, who write mainly in *taraškevica* (Mazzitelli 2011:193-194).

According to the corpus data, the most frequent meaning of *mec'* + Inf. is that of 'scheduled future'. This label, taken from Bybee *et al.* (1994), indicates an event which has been pre-arranged (scheduled) and is yet to occur: "[expected futures] refer either to events which are expected to occur in the near future, or to those which have been pre-arranged, which are sometimes referred to as 'scheduled future'" (*ibid*:249):

200. *Sëleta   17 červenja […] raspačnecca   ŭračystaja   liturhija.*
     this_year 17 June.GEN.SG   begin.FUT.REFL.3SG   solemn.F.NOM.SG   liturgy.NOM.SG

     *A 12-j   u kirunku   Saboru   **mae   rušyc'***
     At 12-LOC.SG in direction.LOC.SG   cathedral.GEN.SG   have.PRS.3SG start.INF

     chrosny   chod
     Cross's.ADJ.M.NOM.SG   procession.NOM.SG

     'This year a solemn liturgy will begin on June, 17 […] A procession towards the
     Cathedral **is expected to/will start** at noon'

If the scheduled event is situated in the past a counterfactual interpretation may arise:

201. *Impreza   **mela   adbycca   13   ljutaha,   ale***
     party.NOM.SG   have.PST.F.SG   take_place.REFL.INF   13[t]   Febraury.GEN   but

     administracyja   admovila   ŭ   jae   pravjadzen'ni
     administration.NOM.SG   refuse.PST.F.SG   in   she.GEN   execution.LOC.SG

     'The party **should have taken place** on February 13, but the administration refused its
     permission to carry it out'

In 202., the event is presented not as having been scheduled by someone else, but by the speaker himself. Hence, it represents an intention[90]:

202. *Z'   Belarus'sju   my   **maem   pracjahvac'** budaŭnictva*
     with   Belarus'.INS   we.NOM have.PRS.1PL continue.INF construction.ACC.SG

     sajuznaj   dzjaržavy
     federal.F.GEN.SG   state.GEN.SG

     'We **intend to continue** the construction of a federal state with Belarus"
     (http://www.svaboda.org/content/article/754160.html)

---

[90] This interpretation is confirmed by the fact, that the above quoted sentence is a translation from Russian. The original sentence, uttered by V.Putin, was: *S Belarus'ju **my namereny** prodolžit' strojtel'stvo sojuznogo gosudarstva,* 'idem'. Russian *byt' namerenym* has the exact meaning of 'intend'.

In other cases the event introduced by *mec'* + Inf. is not presented as scheduled, but as inevitably bound to happen. If the event has already happened (203.), this function may be called 'fatalistic future' (Hansen 2003); If it is still to happen it represents a prediction (204.):

204. *Kali b, adnak, jany vedali, što "Maryjan Haйz" **meй***
if COND nevertheless they.NOM know.PST.PL COMP Marian House have.PST.M.SG
zastacca* *ŭlasnas'cju ajcoй- maryjanaй [...]
remain.REFL.INF property.INS.SG Marian Fathers.GEN.PL
'Nevertheless, if they knew that "Marian House" **would have remained** property of the Marian Fathers […]

204. *Takija pes'ni zaйždy buduc' aktual'nyja i*
such.NOM.PL song.NOM.PL always be.FUT.3PL current.NOM.PL and
*zapatrabavanyja, a sam dysk **mae** **vytrymac'** ne*
requested.NOM.PL and self.M.NOM.SG disc.NOM.SG have.PRS.3SG endure.INF not
adno peravydan'ne
one.N.ACC.SG re-edition.ACC.SG
'Such songs will always be current and popular, and the disc **is destined to be** republished more than once'

The event expressed by *mec'* + Inf. can also be presented as due to happen in the immediate future. In this meaning, which is, according to the corpus data, the rarest one, the function of *mec'* + Inf. is very near to a "pure" future auxiliary. Nevertheless, it still implies a certain obligation flavour, which prevents the classification of *mec'* as a future auxiliary *tout court* (Lomtev 1956a:181):

205. *A što b paraiŭ tym chlopcam, jakija*
and what.ACC COND suggest.PST.M.SG this.DAT.PL boy.DAT.PL which. NOM.PL
*služac' cjaper ci **majuc'** **pajsci** ŭ vojska?*
serve.PRS.3SG now or have.PRS.3PL go.INF in army.ACC.SG
'And what would you suggest to those boys **who are serving now** or are about to // have to join the army?'

The obligation meaning becomes stronger when *mec'* + Inf. expresses the action the subject is supposed to accomplish in order to fulfil given conditions, laid down by an external source, like a law or a regulation (206.) and in order to achieve his/her aim. Another instance of this function is found in 207., where *mec'* + Inf. expresses the purpose an item or an event is supposed to realize:

206. *Pavodle dyrektyvy 2004/58/ES [...] hramadzjanin [...] mae*

according directive.GEN.SG 2004/58/ES citizen.NOM.SG have.PRS.3SG

davesci,* *što mae dastatkovyja hrašovyja

demonstrate.INF COMP have.PRS.3SG sufficient.ACC.PL financial.ACC.PL

srodki

mean.ACC.PL

'According to the directive 2004/58/EC […][in order to receive a visa]t he citizen of a third state in this case has to demonstrate that he has enough money'

207. *Novaja mahistrala **mae zastrachavac'** ad ryzykaŭ*

new.F.NOM.SG highway.NOM.SG have.PRS.3SG secure.INF from risk.GEN.PL

belaruskaha tranyztu

Belarusian.M.GEN.SG transit.GEN.SG

'The new highway should/ is supposed to offer protection from the risks of the transit through Belarus''

One of the most striking properties of the contemporary Belarusian construction *mec'* + Inf. is the semantic component "reference to a previous utterance". Generally, the meaning of *mec'* + Inf. is to be interpreted as referring to something that someone (usually other than the subject of *mec'*) has said, or written (this is typical for Polish *mieć* + Inf. as well, Hansen 2001:134).

Lempp (1986) describes this situation in Polish:

'[…] in *mieć*-sentences there is always a source in view of which something is necessary. […] with *mieć,* the situation is interpreted and not taken for granted. It is justified to introduce the notion of "a source" here, because the speaker does not claim that something is necessary in view of a particular situation, but with respect to what this source wants or claims. The source needs not to be a person. Situations can have the status of sources. […] The presence of this intermediate stage, the source, allows the speaker to keep a certain distance from what he says, because he only says what the source claims.'
(Lempp 1986:70)

The same analysis is true for Belarusian *mec'* + Inf. too, as seen above. Frequently, *mec'* + Inf. is used to represent situations that presuppose reported speech, like press conferences, as it is the case in 207. (the context, where the sentence comes from, is the report of a press conference). The sentence represented in 207. may be thus interpreted as "according to what was said in the press conference, the highway has the purpose of…". The utterance or the written text that represent the "source of the information" may also be an order, a desire, a project (for instance, the sentence in 207. might even be interpreted as "according to the projects of those who have decided to build it, the highway has the purpose of..").

The reference to an external source who has said (ordered, desired, planned) may, sometimes, lead to ambiguity, as in 208.:

208. *Sidorski pavedamiŭ,*   *što*   *zaŭtra*   *ën*   **mae**   **vylecec'**
Sidorski communicate.PST.M.SG COMP   tomorrow he.NOM   have.PRS.3SG fly.INF
u Maskvu
to Moscow.ACC.SG
'Sidorski communicated that tomorrow **he is due/is supposed/intends to fly** to
Moscow'

Here three interpretations are possible: a. Sidorski is due to fly because of the uttered will of an external source (a person), who wants him to fly to Moscow; b. Sidorski is supposed to fly tomorrow, because his flight is scheduled for tomorrow (in this case the flight schedule functions as source, as it compels Sidorski to fly in a specific moment); c. Sidorski intends to fly (the source of this will is Sidorski himself, and it is therefore an intention).

Like in Polish, in Belarusian *mec'* implies a certain lack of epistemic commitment: the speaker does not take responsibility for the veracity of what s/he says, as s/he only repeats what the original source has said.

In 209. the speaker does not commit him/herself to the fact that the law will be actually respected; s/he leaves open the possibility that the situation will evolve in a different way:

209. *Zhodna*   *z*   *zakonam [...] navučan'ne*   *pavodle himnazičnich*
according   with law.INS.SG   study.NOM.SG along   school.ADJ.GEN.PL
prahramaŭ   **mae**   **pačynacca**   *z'*   *pjataj*   *kljasy*
program.GEN.PL have.PRS.3SG begin.INF.REFL   from fifth.F.GEN.SG   class.GEN.SG
'According to the law [...] the study of the high school programs **should begin** in the fifth class [but it might not]'

From what said above it follows, that Belarusian *mec'* has a evidential and epistemic function too: it is frequently used in situations of reported speech (evidential function) and it presupposes a lack of epistemic commitment.

6.4.2 The auxiliary functions of *mecca*

Along with *mec'*, a further Belarusian verb with auxiliary functions is worth mentioning here, though briefly: the reflexive form of 'have', *mecca* (< *mec'* + refl. part. *–sja*) 'be available; be there'.

As far as I could verify, a auxiliary function of the reflexive form of 'have' (present in all Slavic languages, with different meanings) is attested only in East Slavonic languages: Belarusian, Ukrainian and Russian. In the latter *imět'sja* – which expressed a meaning of necessity and scheduled future[91]– is still attested in the 18th century, but it got successively lost, and it is no more used in contemporary Russian. Unlike *mec'*, *mecca* + Inf. is a well-accepted construction in the *narkamaŭka* standard, too, and it is frequently used in the prosa of the Soviet period as well.

In the corpus, only 28 occurrences of *mecca* + Inf. have been found, almost all (27 out of 28) in the past tense. Unlike in the case of *mec'* + Inf., some occurrences in the first peson singular have been registered as well, even though most occurrences are in the third person (plural and singular).

Mecca is primarily used to express the notion of scheduled future in the past, usually with counterfactual interpretation (210.), and intention (typically, not realised; 211.):

210. *Akcyja*   **melasja**   **adbycca**   *ŭ čėrveni […] Ale*
demonstration.NOM.SG have.PAST.REFL.F.SG take_place.INF REFL in June.LOC.SG but
ŭlady   *tradycyjna znajšli*   *pryčyny*   *admovic'*
authority.NOM.SG traditionally find.PAST.PL   cause.ACC.PL refuse.INF
'The demonstration **should have taken place** in June […] But the authorities have found, as always, a reason to refuse [permission]'

211. *Užo*   *ŭ studenckija*   *hady*   *razoŭ*   *kol'ki*   *ja*
already in student's.ADJ.ACC.PL year.ACC.PL time.GEN.PL how_much I.NOM
meŭsja   *z"ezdzic' da babi*   *Prosi*   *na mahilu,*   *ale*
have.PST.REFL.M.SG go.INF   to granny.GEN.SG Prosja.GEN.SG   on grave.ACC.SG but

---

[91] The *Slovar' russkogo jazyka XVIII veka* does not give the meaning of 'scheduled future' for *imět'sja*, but only of 'being necessary' and 'being right and proper'. However, it quotes the following example from A. Kantemir, in which the function of *imět'sja* seems to be exactly 'scheduled future' (*ibid.*:184): *Obyknovenno neprijatel', […]izvědav sostojanie vojska, protiv kotorago **bit'sja imětsja**, nastupaet s toj storony, gdě znaet slabějšim* 'Usually the enemy, […] having got to known the condition of the army against which **he is to fight**, attacks from the side he knows being the weakest'.
At any rate, the possibility cannot be excluded, that this use of *imet'sja* in Russian is a syntactic borrowing from Belarusian/Ukranian.

ŭrešce tak i   ne   sabraŭsja

finally so and NEG   decide.PAST.REFL.M.SG

'Already when I was a student **I had often the intention** of visiting Granny Prosja in the graveyard, but eventually I never went there'

6.5 *Turėti* as modal auxiliary

Unlike *mec'*, *turėti* does not have the function of a temporal auxiliary[92]. However, it does have a modal function: *turėti* represents the major modal of necessity Lithuanian disposes of, the other one being the less frequent *privalėti* 'be under obligation' (Holvoet 2009:200). It can express dynamic (212.), deontic (213.) and epistemic modality (214.) (Holvoet 2007:159; Šolienė 2012:14). Unlike *mec'*, *turėti* shows a full paradigm even in its auxiliary functions.

212. *Arturai,   nueikim   prieš vakarienę   išgerti   kokteilių.   Aš   būtinai*

Artur.VOC go.IMP.2PL before dinner.ACC.SG   drink.INF cocktail.GEN.PL   I.NOM   absolutely

turiu   išgerti

have.PRS.1SG drink.INF

'Artur, let's go drink some cocktails before dinner. I really **need to drink** something'

213. *Teismo   sprendimu   G.Rapoportas   indėlininkams   turės*

court.GEN.SG   decision.INS.SG G.Rapoportas.NOM depositor.DAT.PL have.FUT.3SG

sumokėti *45.454 JAV dolerius*

pay.INF   45.454 USA dollar.ACC.PL

'Because of the decision of the court G. Rapoportas **will have to pay** the depositors 45.454 US dollar'

214. *Policijai   pranešėt?   - Pranešėm.   Laukiam.   Jau*

police.DAT.SG inform.FUT.2PL inform.FUT.1PL wait.IMP.1PL already

turėtų   atvažiuoti*, - atsakė   Juozas*

have.COND.3 come.INF   answer.PST.3 Juozas.NOM

'Will you inform the police? – We will. Let's wait. They **should already be coming**, Juozas answered'

---

[92] The future tense in Lithuanian is analytically formed with the suffix –*s*- added to the verbal stem:
turė-ti.INF → *turė-s*.FUT-*iu*.1Sg 'I will have'.

6.6 *Mec'* and *turėti* in resultative constructions

Possessive perfects built with the help of 'have'-verbs are considered to be one of the characteristic features of the SAE, *Standard Average European* (Haspelmath 2001:1495[93]). Such perfects can be found neither in Lithuanian nor in Belarusian. Lithuanian forms its perfect by means of the auxiliary 'be' (215.), while Belarusian does not have a perfect at all[94]:

215. *Teroristai   niekada **nėra**   **turėję**   tokio laimikio*
      terrorist.NOM.PL   never   NEG.be.PRS.3. have.PaPA.M.NOM.PL such prize.GEN.SG
      'Terrorists **have never had** such a prize'

'Have' may be used in resultative constructions in both languages, even if very rarely. The question of the expression of resultatives (and of perfects) in these two languages is, of course, too complex to be tackled here in a detailed manner, as the subject deserves. However, a few remarks can be made.

In Lithuanian two types of 'have'-resultatives are found (Wiemer and Giger 2005:47-8). In the first type, the verb *turėti* is accompanied by the past passive participle (216.)[95], in the second by the past active participle (217.):

216. *Žinau,   kas   nori   kurti   filmą   apie*
      know.PRS.1SG someone.NOM.SG want.PRS.3 produce.INF movie.ACC.SG about

      sukilimo   vadą   Antaną   Mackevičių.   Žinau,
      uprising.GEN.SG   leader.ACC.SG Antanas.ACC   Mackevičius.ACC know.PRS.1SG

      kas   turi   parašytą   scenarijų   apie Emiliją
      someone.NOM.SG have.PRS.3 written.PPP.M.ACC.SG   script.ACC.SG   about Emilija.ACC

      Pliaterytę
      Pliaterytė.ACC

      'I know that someone wants to produce a movie about the leader of the uprising

      Antanas Mackevičius. I know that someone **has written a script** [lit. '**has a (already)**

      written script'] about Emilija Pliaterytė'

      (http://www.respublika.lt/lt/naujienos/pramogos/kinas_muzika_tv/kodel_merdi_patriotiskas_kinas/,print.1)

---

[93] Heine and Kuteva (2006) consider the concept of 'possessive perfect' in broader sense, including in this category also the North Russian perfect, built with the help of the possessive locative construction *u* + Gen. About the influence that western European *have*-perfects might have had on the North Russian constructions, see the discussion in Danylenko 2005.

[94] The general past form of Belarusian verbs, employing a l-participle (so called because it is formed adding a *l-* – in Belarusian, because of phonetic rules, changed into [ŭ]- to the verbal stem) actually derives from a Common Slavic perfect, where the *l*-participle was a past active participle: **ja esm' rabilŭ* [lit. 'I am having.done'] 'I have done'. Therefore, originally, Slavic perfects were 'be'- and not 'have'-perfects.

[95] In the corpus I have found no occurrences of this resultative construction: Wiemer and Giger (2005:47) state, in fact, that it is indeed a very rare construction.

163

217.   *[Romanas] vadinasi   "Anapus   ežios".   Siužeto   užuomazga*

[Novel]   call.PRS.REFL.3 on_the_other_side border.GEN.SG plot.GEN.SG nucleus.NOM.SG

maždaug tokia -   žmogus   rengiasi   skristi į Lietuvą,

roughly   such.F.NOM.SG   person.NOM,SG prepare.PRS.REFL 3SG. fly.INF in Lithuania.ACC

turi   nusipirkęs   bilietą, *   skutasi   barzdą   ir*

have.PRS.3 buy.PaPA.M.SG.REFL. ticket.ACC.SG shave.PRS. REFL 3. beard.ACC.SG and

staiga į jo   kambarį   įsiveržia   du   juodi

suddenly in he.GEN   room.ACC.SG break_in.PRS.REFL.3 two.M.NOM   black.M.NOM.PL

jaunuoliai…

guy.NOM.PL…

'The title [of the novel] is "On the other side of the border". The heart of the plot is more or less the following – a man is about to fly to Lithuania, he has bought [lit. '**he has having.bought'**] the ticket, he is shaving when suddenly two black guys break into his room…'

Both types of 'have'-resultatives (and particularly the first) are very rarely used. Usually Lithuanian uses rather a 'be'-construction, involving the past active participle (Geniušienė and Nedjalkov 1988:382-3), the one which, as seen above, has developed into a perfect:

218.   *Jis   **nusipirkęs**   namą   kaime*

he.NOM   buy.PaPA.M.NOM.SG.REFL house.ACC.SG countryside.LOC.SG

'He has bought [lit. '**he is having-bought'**] a house in the countryside'

(Geniušienė and Nedjalkov 1998:383)

As Wiemer and Giger (2005:48) point out, the second resultative construction, with *turėti* and an active past participle, is "a typological rarity". Similar constructions are attested in Greek (in the transitional period between the Hellenic *koiné* and Middle Greek) and, even if subdued to consistent constraints, in Cashubian. Otherwise there seems to be no analogue constructions in the world (*ibid.*). Actually, in the Polish dialect of Vilnius (*wileńska polszczyzna*) similar constructions are found, but for them a contact-induced origin may be supposed: *ja mam.*'have.1SG' *zrobifšy.*'have.PaPA' *sweter* 'I have made a sweater' (Adomavičiutė and Čekmonas 1991: 98).

As for Belarusian, in the standard language *mec'* is not usually used in resultative constructions. No grammar of Belarusian, as far as I could verify, mentions this use of *mec'*, and also most native speakers have rejected *mec'* in this function. On the Internet, however, some examples have been found:

219.   ***Maju   napisany   kinascenaryj*** *   pra heraičnuju*

have.PRS.1SG   written.PPP.M.ACC.SG movie_script.ACC.SG   about heroic.F.ACC.SG

abaronu   *Bresckaj*   *krepasci*

defense.ACC.SG   Brest.ADJ fortress.GEN

'I have written [lit. 'I **have it (already) written'**] a movie script about the heroic defense of the

Fortress of Brest'

(http://www.kimPRESs.by/index.phtml?page=2&id=1522&mode=print)

220.   *Ci*   *praŭda*   *toe,*   *što*   *Vy*   *skupili*   *na*

       Q   truth.NOM.SG   this.N.NOM.SG   COMP   you.PL.NOM   buy.PST.PL   in

       Haradzenščyne   *celuju*   *vësku?*   *– Ne. […] Syn*   ***mae***

       Hrodna_region.LOC.SG   entire.ACC.SG   village.ACC.SG   No   son.NOM.SG have.PRS.3SG

       kuplenyja   ***dva***   ***damy***   *davaennaj*   *pabudovy*

       bought.PPP.ACC.PL   two.ACC   house.ACC.PL   pre-war.F.GEN.SG   construction.GEN.SG

       'Is that true, that you have bought a whole village in the region of Hrodna? –No. […] My son

       has bought two houses (lit. '**he has them bought'**) of pre-war construction […]'

       (http://udf.by/news/nopolitic/32-milinkevich-lyubimy-palitychny-anyekdot.html)

The constructions with *mec'* and a past passive participle are more frequent in the language of the Belarusian authors in the Emigration or in the language of authors of the pre-war (pre-1945) period[96]. Their language, yet, has a clear Western Belarusian (regions of Vilnius and Hrodna) print, when even not directly a Polish print (usually, authors in the emigration wrote in *taraškevica*). It might be that resultative constructions with *mec'* are typical for Western Belarusian dialects, but I have no reliable data on this point.

In standard Belarusian (like in Russian), it is usually *u* + Gen. that is used in resultative contexts, as in 221.:

221.   *Pra*   *mamu,*   *Natallju*   *Cimafeeŭnu,*   ***u mjane***   ***napisana***

       about mama.ACC.SG   Natallja.ACC   Cimafeeŭna.ACC   at I.GEN   written.PPP.N.ACC.SG

       njamala   *veršaŭ*

       much.ADV   verse.GEN.PL

       'I have written [lit. **at me written many verses'**] many verses about my Mom, Natallja

       Cimafeeŭna'

       (http://av-smi.gomel-region.by/ru/numbers?art_id=3786

---

[96] In my corpus texts of this period are not included. However, I have compiled a smaller corpus of texts, produced before 1980, both in Belarus' and in the emigration, and I have searched it for resultative constructions with *mec'*. I have found expressions such as *[ën] meŭ z'vjazanyja ruki* 'his hands were tied up' [lit. 'he had tied hands'] (Ja. Hermanovič, *Kitaj-Sibir-Maskva*, 1962, published in Canada, in *taraškevica*).

6.7 Belarusian and Lithuanian 'have' in an areal perspective

In an areal perspective, Lithuanian and Belarusian 'have'-verbs seem to be "half-way" between the "strong" 'have'-verbs of their Western neighbours (Czech, Polish and Slovak) and the "weak" *imet'* in Russian (not to mention the inexistent Latvian and Finnic 'have')[97].

Czech *mít* 'have' can be surely defined as "strong". It can express all possessive notions and it can even be used to express experiential notions like 'I am hungry': *mám hlad* [lit. 'I have hunger'], even if this is probably due to a calque from German (Clancy 2010:241)[98]. Czech *mít* has also been grammaticalized as a modal, evidential and even quasi-perfect (in the so-called "New Slavic Perfect" construction) auxiliary (Clancy 2010:160).

Polish *mieć* has been grammaticalized in the same auxiliary functions as Czech *mít* (but see Sawicki 2011 for the use of *mieć* in perfect-like constructions).

Both Polish and Czech 'have' can be used to express diseases and physical characteristics[99]:

Polish

222. *Marcin* **miał** *poważne* ***przeziębienie**, na szczęście*
Marcin.NOM   have.PST.M.SG serious.N.ACC.SG cold.ACC.SG   in luck.ACC.SG
czuje   się   lepiej
feel.PRS.3SG REFL better
'Marcin **had a serious cold**, luckily he feels better'
(Korpus IPI PAN: http://korpus.pl/poliqarp/poliqarp.php?context=115)

Czech

223. *Měla   blond vlasy,   velké   oči...*
have.PST.F.SG blond hair.ACC.PL big.ACC.PL   eye.ACC.PL
'She had blond hair, big eyes…'
(Clancy 2010:13)

It must be said that, like Belarusian, Polish and Czech do not use 'have' to express feelings like 'homesickness': Pol. ***mam tęsknotę** za ojczyzną* I have homesickness for homeland; Cz. ***mám touhu** po domově* 'id.'. In both languages a verbal construction would be used: Pol. ***tęsknię za ojczyzną***, Cz. ***stýská se mi** po domově* 'I feel homesick'.

---

[97] By the definitions "strong" and "weak" 'have' I refer to the ability a 'have'-verb has to express as more possessive notions as possible, and on the number of non-possessive functions it can fulfil.
[98] Polish in this case – just like Lithuanian and Belarusian- uses an adjectival expression: *jestem głodny* 'I am hungry'
[99] See Clancy 2010 about Czech and Polish 'have', Lempp 1986 about Polish.

Both verbs may be used to express Location and Physical Possession: Cz. *mít **v ruce***, Pol. *mieć **w ręce*** 'to have (hold) in one's hand'; Cz. *mít **na sobě***, Pol. *mieć **na siebie*** 'to have on; to wear'.

A interesting example of the difference between Czech and Polish and Belarusian 'have'-verbs may be seen in the cases Mrázek (1990:47) labels as "semi-possessive", and which I would call "implicational".

The sentence presented in 224. provides information about the characteristic of the 'son' (he is an engineer), but also about the possessive relation between him and his father/mother, the subject, who is the topic of the sentence: 's/he has a son' + 'the son is an engineer'. The same in 225.: this sentence predicates the location of the coat and, at the same time, its being a possession of the subject:

Czech

224. *Má   syna   inženýrem*
     have.PRS.3SG son.ACC.SG   engineer.INS.SG
     'His son is an engineer' [lit. 'he has a son engineer']

225. *Plášt'   máš   na věšaku*
     coat.ACC.SG   have.PRS.2SG on coatstand.LOC.SG
     'Your coat hangs on the coat stand' [lit. 'you have the coat on the coat stand']
     (Mrázek 1990:47)

Such constructions are present in Polish as well: *ma syna inżyniera*, *płaszcz masz na wieszaku*. Czech and Polish, thus, can use their 'have' verb in an implicational meaning both with inalienable and with alienable Possessees ('son', 'coat').

In East Slavic languages 'have' is not admitted in this context, but it is substituted by constructions with post-nominal *u* + Gen. (see 5.12.3), which has exactly the function of expressing the Possessor's "implication": Belarusian *syn **u jaho** inžyner* 'his son is an engineer', *pinžak **u cjabe** na vešalcy* 'your coat is on the coatstand'. Most Belarusian native speakers I have asked about have rejected *mec'* in both cases[100]: **ën **mae** syna inžynera*; **pinžak **maeš** na vešalcy*.

In Lithuanian expressions like *jis turi sūnų mokytoją* 'his son is a schoolteacher' [lit. 'he has a son teacher'] are perfectly acceptable. On the contrary, native speakers have considered *turėti* in expressions like *paltą turi ant kabyklos* 'your coat hangs on the coat stand' [lit. 'you have the coat on the coat stand'], unacceptable, and have suggested instead to use an adnominal construction: ***tavo** paltas yra (kabo) ant kabyklos* '**your** coat is (hangs) on the coat stand'.

---

[100] However, a native speaker had told me that in his village (Soly, in North-Western Belarus', on the border with Lithuania), sentences like *mae syna inžynera* are perfectly accepted and even widely used.

On the other side, Russian *imet'* seems a good example of a "weak" 'have'-verb. It has no auxiliary functions (it had them in Old Russian, but they got successively lost, Hansen 2003:13) and it can express only a few possessive notions, among which ownership is not included[101],[102]: "in all development phases of the Russian language the construction *u menja est'* ['at me (there) is'] decidedly dominates over the construction *ja imeju* ['I have']. This is confirmed by the fact that in all examined works of both Old Russian and contemporary authors *ja imeju* in the meaning of "owning" is not used at all" (Safarewiczowa 1964:20; my translation and glosses).

It is evident, thus, that *mec'* and *turėti* share some properties with the "strong" 'have' verbs of their Western neighbours Czech and Polish (the possibility of expressing ownership, the auxiliary functions and, to some extent, the possibility of being used in resultative constructions) and they also share some properties of their "weak" Russian neighbour *imet'* (they are not used to form perfect and in a whole range of contexts 'be'-constructions are preferred).

At any rate, Lithuanian *turėti* seems to have some "strong" properties more than Belarusian *mec'*. Unlike the latter, in fact, it can express the action of 'holding in one's hand', it can be used with an implicational meaning (*jis turi sūnų mokytoją* 'his son is a schoolteacher')*,* it is (relatively) more used in resultative constructions and, finally, it has a decidedly stronger role as modal auxiliary than *mec'*. All these functions except for the latter are performed in Belarusian by *u* + Gen.

Now, it is quite reasonable to suppose that areal influences have played a considerable role in determining this transitional, "half-way" nature of *mec'* and *turėti*, which are neither completely "strong" nor completely "weak".

Contact with its Western neighbouring languages might be invoked, first of all, to explain why Lithuanian has developed a 'have' verb (just like contact with Finnic has been invoked to explain why Latvian has not developed a 'have'-verb, Vykypěl 2001:221). The fact that *turėti* has its preferred "niche of use" in the field of ownership suggests that Lithuanian has created its 'have'-verb, taking ir from the field of Physical Possession ('hold' > 'have'), exactly to express this notions. A further development of *turėti* into the field of Inalienable Possession and the expression of experiential situations (as in the case of diseases) or towards the creation of a possessive perfect might have been slowed down, or interrupted, also because of the influence of the 'be' languages of the area (Finnic, Latvian itself, maybe already Russian). Contact with these languages might have helped Lithuanian in strengthening the use of the old dative or of the newly-formed 'topicalised genitive' (both 'be'-based constructions) in these functions.

---

[101] It must be remembered that *imet'* may be used as suppletive form for participles, infinitives, gerunds and imperatives. In this case, then again, its use is not semantically but syntactically motivated.

[102] Guiraud-Weber and Mikaeljan (2004:65) also claim that the scope of use of *imet'* in the media and in the bureaucratic language has decidedly grown in the last decades, with consequences on spoken Russian too.

On the other hand, it seems also probable that contact with Polish has led *turėti* to develop the "strong" properties seen above, many of which are shared with Polish *mieć*. The fact that, even in embryonic form, *turėti* is used in a quasi-perfect meaning might be ascribed to this contact too.

As far as Belarusian is concerned, the pervasive use of the inherited construction *u* + Gen. in possessive function is a Russian innovation, which has successively spread into the Belarusian and Ukrainian territories (Prochorova 1991:45). It was probably the contact with the neighbouring 'have'-languages (Polish, maybe even already Lithuanian) that prevented Belarusian from completely losing its inherited 'have'-verb *mec'*, or from strikingly reducing its functions, as Russian did (in its turn, probably helped in this by the contact with Finnic).

As said above, the influence of Russian on Belarusian in the last two centuries (especially during the Soviet period and nowadays) must also be taken into consideration: it may well be that it has played a very important role in strengthening further *u* + Gen. at the expense of *mec'*.

Conclusions

In the foregoing, it has been shown that, as far as our topic is concerned, Belarusian and Lithuanian show striking similarities. In both of them a 'have' verb is found, whose primary function is to express ownership and which has spread until it became able to express all possessive notions (5.1, 5.2). However, it is disliked in a whole range of contexts, which are, in large part, the same in the two languages (6.1, 6.2).

Both Belarusian and Lithuanian, albeit to different extents, use dative possessive constructions, and even in the same contexts: expressions of age and social relations (5.5, 5.6).

In both languages, two constructions are found, whose syntactic interpretation is ambiguous: the Lithuanian 'topicalised genitive' and the Belarusian post-nominal *u* + Gen. (5.12). Moreover, the functions of these two constructions are similar: they cannot be used in instances of Inalienable Possession where the communicative focus is on the possessive relation itself, but only in descriptive instances of Inalienable Possession.

Some minor possessive constructions are found, whose use is almost the same in the two languages: the comitative constructions and ablative constructions with *nuo* and *ad* for the expression of part-whole relations (5.7, 5.8, 5.9).

Obviously, some differences between the two languages can be observed too, first of all in the field of prototypical Possession (ownership): Lithuanian can only use its 'have' strategy (*turėti*), whereas Belarusian can use both *mec'* and the adessive construction *u* + Gen..Then, Lithuanian *turėti* shows more properties typical of "strong" 'have'-verbs than Belarusian *mec'* (6.7). Also, the scope of use of the possessive dative in Lithuanian is broader than it is in Belarusian: unlike the latter, Lithuanian may use it with Possessee NPs denoting diseases and "incomplete physical details" (5.6). However, in the particular case of the BKI-constructions, it is Belarusian that makes a greater use of the possessive dative, whereas Lithuanian mostly uses 'have' (5.13). Finally, Lithuanian employs comitative constructions in predicative position more often and in more contexts than Belarusian (5.8, 5.11).

The similarities observed in these languages (and in particular those concerning the behaviour of 'have') may be ascribed to three factors: to the close genetic affiliation, to language contact and, finally, to general trends, acting in all languages of the world.

As far as the genetic affiliation is concerned, it is quite clear that, for instance, Belarusian and Lithuanian dispose both of a possessive dative construction because Indo-European, from which both languages are derived, most likely used a dative strategy to express Possession. The common

genetic origin should also be invoked to explain why these two languages use the dative case in the same contexts (expressions of age and social relations).

Areal influences may be invoked to explain why Lithuanian has created a 'have'-verb, instead of continuing to use its inherited possessive dative, and why Belarusian has retained its *mec'*, instead of completely losing it or strikingly reducing its functions, as Russian did. On the other hand, areal influences may also be invoked to explain why they have not become "strong" 'have'-languages like their Western neighbours Czech and Polish.

Areal influences, however, have also contributed to the differences that may be seen in these two languages: in fact, it is because of contact with Finnic (through Russian dialects, Prochorova 1991:45) that Belarusian has developed even more the possessive functions of its adessive construction (in comparison with the possessive meaning it probably had already in Late Common Slavic). It might be supposed that, if this contact would have not taken place, Belarusian would have strengthened the possessive functions of the inherited dative construction (as Lithuanian partially did) or it would have strengthened the functions of *mec'* even more (as Polish did).

On the Lithuanian side, contact with Polish might have strengthened *turėti* and might have led it to acquire the "strong" properties Belarusian *mec'* lacks.

In general, both languages may be said to be representing what Isačenko (1974) labels as 'transitional' type between 'have' and 'be'-languages. In fact, even if in both Belarusian and Lithuanian (and particularly in the latter) 'have' is surely a major strategy for the expression of Possession, it shows, nevertheless, a whole range of restrictions on its use, and it has not developed some of the typical functions of "strong" 'have'-verbs. Therefore, the definition of transitional[103] between the "strong" 'have'-languages (like German o Czech) and the "strong" 'be'-languages (like Latvian or Russian) seems to be the most adequate way to describe them.

It has already been said, that Isačenko considers Belarusian as a transitional language. However, his statement is not completely clear: "under the influence of Polish, which very early begins to incorporate *have*-constructions, Ukrainian and Belorussian (sic) are becoming H-languages" (Isačenko 1974:73).

It is not very clear, whether Isačenko's claim must be understood, as referring to the synchronic or to the diachronic level: that is, whether he reckons that Belarusian is now moving towards an even greater "*haveness*". In this case, I would say that this does not correspond to the situation. In Belarusian the locative strategy is still the strongest one. It may be used in a whole range of contexts, where *mec'* is decidedly disliked, and, moreover, has taken over some non-possessive functions that *mec'*, as seen above, cannot fulfil (unlike *u* + Gen., *mec'* does not have an

---

[103] I understand this as a synchronic definition: Lithuanian and Belarusian are transitional so far as they share some properties with the 'have'- languages and some others with the 'be'-languages.

implicational meaning, cannot be used in expressions of 'holding' and it is not used to form a perfect). It seems to me, thus, that there are no signs of *u* + Gen. somehow "giving way" to *mec'*.

Moreover, I would not say that Polish influence has actively caused Belarusian to "become" a 'have'-language. Belarusian has inherited its 'have'-verb from Common Slavic, and, therefore, it is always been a 'have'-language. Yet, it is most probable that, as said above, Polish influence has contributed in strengthening the use of the inherited 'have'-strategy, preventing it from disappearing or from becoming a very "weak" 'have'-verb, like Russian *imet'*.

The data presented in this work have also brought further evidence to what Činčlej (1990:141) claims: that is, that Lithuanian should not be considered as a 'have'-language tout court, as Isačenko does, but it should be rather considered as a transitional language too. Of course, when considering the expression of ownership only, Lithuanian is decidedly a 'have'-language. If, yet, one considers the whole range of possessive notions and the whole range of other constructions used to express them (dative case, topicalised genitive, comitative constructions) the picture is definitely not a "'have'-only" one[104].

---

[104] It must be said that Isačenko does not limit his analysis to the field of the means of expression of predicative Possession, but he analyses also other factors, which he consideres typical for 'have' or 'be' languages: the presence/absence of a possesive perfect, the presence/absence of modals, the possibility to use the verb 'belong' to express Location, etc. Actually, as Činčlej (1990) demonstrates, Lithuanian is transitional with reference to these parameters too.

APPENDIX

Questionnaires

In the questionnaires, I presented sentences that I extrapolated from the corpus and modified, in order to get the constructions I wanted to have tested.

For instance, I took the following sentence:

Belarusian

    a.   *Budynak **meŭ**   **admyslovy**   **pakoj-sejf**   z   masiŭnymi*

        building have.PST.M.SG special.M.ACC.SG   safe_room.ACC.SG   with massive.INS.PL

        kratami   va vonkach

        bar.INS.PL   in window.LOC.PL

        'The **building had a special safe room** with massive bars on the windows'

When I compiled the questionnaires, I modified this sentence into ***u muzeja***[105] ***byŭ*** *admyslovy pakoj-sejf* 'id'. [lit. **'at the museum there was** a special safe room…']: in this way, it has been possible to verify the acceptability of *u* + Gen. in this particular meaning (inclusive locative relations, see).

During the test, I asked native speakers to read the sentences and to highlight all the "mistakes", or the unusual things they might observe. I also asked them to propose a "correct" variant of the "wrong" constructions.

Here below are reported the sentences, that have been presented in the questionnaire, together with the remarks of those, who have fulfilled it. In the original version, the sentences were distributed in two questionnaires, that were distributed to two groups of informants. Each informant fulfilled only one questionnaire.

In the cases, where the informants have remarked nothing, I have interpreted this as the evidence, that the construction is probably grammatical. However, the possibility, that some ungrammatical constructions have not been noticed by the native speakers that have fulfilled the questionnaire, cannot be excluded.

Here, the examined construction has been highlighted with bold characters; in the original version, of course, there was no evidence. In the questionnaires, there were also sentences with no possessive constructions: they had been included, in order to "distract" the native speakers. Here, these sentences are not reported. Moreover, here the sentences are organized, according to the

---

[105] I have replaced *budynak* 'building' with *muzej* 'museum', because, in the former, the locative and the genitive case formally coincide: *u budynku* {GEN.SG // LOC.SG 'in the // at the museum'.

syntactic construction they present. In the original version, of course, the sentences were presented in random order.

A. Belarusian questionnaire

1) DATIVE CASE

Dative case: ownership

1. *My zaŭtra i vernemsja, zamoŭlju taksoŭku, sto kilametraŭ usjaho ŭ dva baki. A tam na vyspe mne dom, ujaŭljaeš, vozera I malen'kaja vyspa, navokal nikoha, bližejšaja vëska i taja ne na beraze, a za hrėbljaj, vakol adna vada.*

    'We will come back tomorrow, I will call a taxi, it is just a hundred kilometers, there and back. An there I have a house [lit. '**to me.DAT a house'**] on the island, can you imagine that, lakes and a small island, no-one around, even the nearest village is not on the lakeside, but beyond the weir, around us there is only water.'

    Corrected into:
    1 out of 8: *a tam – moj dom!* 'and there – my house!'
    6 out of 8: *u mjane dom*

2. *Hėta davoli istotnaja prablema – pry vyvučėnni zamežnaj movy belaruskamoŭnyja ljudzi čascej za usë vymušanyja karystacca movaj-pasjarėdnicaj – ruskaj. Dzjakavac' lësu, nam užo ësc' njamecka-belarusi, anhlijska-belaruski, pol'ska-belaruski, ukrainska-belaruski sloŭniki dyj kol'ki inšych.'*

    'This is quite a serious problem. When they want to learn a foreign language, Belarusian-speaking people often have to use an intermediate language –Russian. Thanks God, we already have [lit. **'to us.DAT is'**] a German-Belarusian, English-BElarusian, Polish-Belarusian, Ukrainian-Belarusian dictionary, and some more.'

    Corrected into:
    5 out of 9: *u nas ësc'*
    2 out of 9: *maem* 'we have'
    3 out of 9: *maem* or *u nas ësc'*

Dative case: Abstract possession

3. *Tady spračalisja ŭ rėhiënach: ci Milinkevič, ci Karcienka. Ja jaho vel'mi pavažaju, maem z im vel'mi dobryja stasunki. Ёn mne sam skazaŭ: davaj, budzeš ty, bo tabe bol'š šancaŭ.*

    'In that time, people fought in the regions: either Milinkevic or Karcienka. I respect him very much, we are in very good terms. He has even told me: okay, you will run [for elections], because you have [lit. '**to you.DAT (are)'**] more chances.

    Corrected into:
    9 out of 10: *u cjabe bol'š šancaŭ*

Dative case: Social possession

4. *Tak Nasta apynulasja ŭ Vil'ni – tam akurat adnavili belaruski pėdahahičny fakul'tėt, a Uladzimer Kolas daŭ ėj vydatnuju charaktarystyku. Pa skančėnni vjarnulasja ŭ mensk. Cjaper Nasta pracuje ŭ rekljamnym biznėse i **ėj** trochhadovy syn.*

'And so Nasta found herself in Vilnius. Right at that time and right there the Belarusian Pedagogical University had been reopened, and Uladzimer Kolas had given it an excellet character. After her graduation, she went back to Minsk. Now Nasta works in advertising, and she has [lit. **'to her.DAT (is)'**] a three-years-old son.'

Corrected into:
6out of9: *u jae trochhadovy syn*
1 out of 9: *mae trochhadovaha syna*
2 out of 9**:** *u jae* or *mae*

Dative case: Inalienable possession: physical characteristics

5. *Nasta- maja staraja sjabroŭka, jaščė sa školy. U našym klase ŭse ličyli jae pryhažunjaj. **Ėj byli** svetlyja valasy, vočy blakitnyja, vysokaja...*

'Nasta is an old friend of mine, from the time of the school. In our class, all considered her to be a beauty. She had [lit. **'to her.DAT were'**] blond hair, blue eyes, she was tall...'

Corrected into:
9 out of 9: *u jae*
1 out of 9: *u jae byli* or *jana mela*

6. *U peršyja dni listapada ŭ špital' prybyli dva pacyenty z pastrėl'nymi ranami: **adnamu starejšamu byla peralamanaja kuljaj ruka, druhomu-ž, chlapcu hadoŭ 14, prastrėl'naja naha.***

'In the first days of November two patients with gunfire injuries arrived to the hospital: the **oldest one had an arm** [lit. 'to oldest.DAT was arm'], broken by a bullet; the second, a guy aged around fourteen, **had a shot leg** [lit. 'to boy.DAT was shot leg'].

Corrected into:
6 out of 10: *u adnaho starėjšaha*
1 out of 10: *meli*

Dative case: Inanimate possession

7. *Tėma fil'mu – karotkija ėcjudy ad 20 rėžysėraŭ, jakija pryznajucca ŭ ljubovi da Paryžu. **Kožynamu raënu ėsc' svaja historyja** – i hėtyja historyi peravažna lyryčnyja.*

'The subject of the film are short études by twenty directors, who express their love to Paris. Every neighbourhood has [lit. '**to every neighbourhood.DAT** is'] its own story – and these stories are, in great measure, lyrical.'

Corrected into:
6 out of 9: ***u kožnaha raëna***
1 out of 9: ***pra kožny raën*** ('about every neighbourhood')
1 out of 9: ***u kožnaha raëna*** abo ***kožny raën mae***

Dative case: Inanimate Abstract possession

8. *Uladzmer Njakljaeŭ rytaryčna zapytaŭsja, "čamu kepska havaryc' praŭdu za rasejskijahrošy". **Belaruskaj historyi** ёsc' adkaz na hėtae pytanne.*

'Uladzimer Njakljaeŭ rhetorically asked, why should it be bad to tell the truth, even if it is the
Russians who pay for this. The Belarusian history has [lit. '**to the Belarusian history.DAT is'**] the answer to this question'

Corrected into:
7 out of 9: ***u belaruskaj historyj,*** unclear: Locative 'in the Belarusian history' or Genitive 'at the Belarusian history'
1 out of 9: ***belaruskaja historyja mae***
1 out of 9: ***u ёj možna znajsci*** 'in it [history] (it is) possible to find…

2) *MEC'*

Mec': Inalienable possession: Permanent physical characteristics

9. *Typovy Belarus **mae blakintnyja abo šeryja vočy***

'The typical Belarusian **has blue or grey eyes'**

Remarks:
2 out of 9: the sentence is good, but it would also be possible to say ***u typovaha belarusa***

10. *Sa svajho kabineta vyjšaŭ daŭno ne bačany mnoj čalavek, mažny, jaki **meŭ abvislyja vusy** – Viktar Praŭdzin.*

'A man, whom I had not seen since a long time, portly, who had a flabby moustache, went out from his office. It was Viktar Praŭdzin.'

Corrected into:
3 out of 9: ***čalavek mažny, z abvislymi vusami***

11. *Z fatahrafii na mjane hljadzic' davoli stalaha veku čalavek, jaki, mjarkujučy pa ŭsim, šmat čaho peražyŭ. **Ёn mae maladyja i dobryja vočy**, u jakich svecicca mudrasc' i spakoj.*

'A quite old man - who, judging by evidence, has experienced many things - looks at me from the photo. **He has young and good eyes**, shining with wisdom and peace.

Corrected into:
2 out of 9: ***u jaho byli***

2 out of 9: the sentence is good, but it would be better with **u jaho byli**

Mec': Inalienable possession: Temporary physical characteristics

12. *Staryja damy havorac' pra žanočae – pra dzjacej, chvaroby, sënnjašny čas. Spadarynja Halina **mae chvoryja nohi**, i pani Èl'žbeta zapisvae pamer, kab nabyc' ëj u Varšave specyjal'nyja humovyja škarpètki.*

    'The old ladies talk about "women's subjects": children, illnesses, the present time. Miss Halina's legs are ill [lit. **'has ill legs]**, and mrs. Èlžbeta writes down a note, in order to remember to buy her special gum socks in Warsaw.'

    Corrected into:
    5 out of 10: **u Haliny** *chvoryja nohi*

*Mec'***: Physical possession (***mec' u rukach***)**

13. *Čytaju dalej i ne veru svaim vačom. Svajtar T., jakoha ja znaŭ bol'š dvaccaci hadoŭ, jak dobraha, razumnaha, pabožnaha čalaveka, jak duchoŭnika i prapavednika – vos' ën u zapiscy, **jakuju maju ŭ rukach**, piša i tlumačyc', što matèryjalistyja ŭ navucy majuc' racyju i što, značyc', Boha njama.*

    'I read further and I cannot trust my own eyes. The priest T., whom I have known more than twenty years as a good, intelligent, pious man, as a priest and a preacher – this same man writes, in the note **I have in my hands**, that, as far as science is concerned, materialists have right and, thus, there is no God.'

    Corrected into:
    2 out of 10: **trymaju ŭ rukach**
    3 out of 10: **trymaju** or **u mjane ŭ rukach**
    4 out of 10: have marked the sentence as wrong, but have proposed no variants

*Mec'***: Temporary possession**

14. - *Anja, ci vedaeš, dze kniha,   jakuju my pupili ŭ Italii, pamjateš, pra staražytny Rym? Ne mahu jae nidze znajsci... - Tak, vedaju, **jae mae Paval.***

    'Anja, do you know where is the book that we had bought in Italy, you know, about ancient Rome? I can't find it. - Yes, I know, **Paul has it**.'

    Corrected into:
    3 out of 3: **jana ŭ Paŭla**

Mec': feelings, abstract Possessees auch as *bjada* 'trouble'

15. ***Ja maju bjadu***. *Tydzen' tamu sadžusja ranicaj u svoj "opel'" i takoe aadčuvanne, što na im čužy paedziŭ. Ty ž vedaeš, jak ja da svajho "opelja" staŭljusja, jak da žonki, a to j lepš.*

'I am in trouble. A week ago, I sit down in my *Opel* and I have such a feeling, as though some else has used it. You know, how I treat my *Opel*: like a wife, and even better.'

Corrected into:
6 out of 9[106]: *u mjane bjada*
1 out of 9: *maju bjadu* is possibile, but *u mjane bjada* is better

Mec': Social possession

16.   *U našaj škole važnaja navina:* **maem novuju nastaǔnicu** *belaruskaj movy.*

'In our school there are important news: **we have a new teacher** of Belarusian language.'

Remarks:
2 out of 9: the sentence is good, but it would also be possible to say *u nas novaja nastaǔnica*

3) GENITIVE CASE

Genitive case: Moral characteristics

17.   *Muž Aly* **byǔ dobraha sèrca i spahadlivaj dušy,** *ljubiǔ čytac' veršy i sam ich pisaǔ.*

'Ala's husband had a good heart and a sensible soul [lit. '**was good.GEN heart.GEN and sensible.GEN soul.GEN**'], he liked to read poetry and he wrote poems himself.'

Corrected into:
2 out of 10: *muž Aly meǔ*
3 out of 10: *u muža Aly*
1 out of 10: *byǔ z dobrym sèrcam*
1 out of 10: *byǔ čalavekam dobraha sèrca*
1 out of 10: *byǔ čalavekam z dobrym sèrcam*
1 out of 10 : *meǔ dobrae sèrca* or *byǔ čalavekam dobraha sèrca*

Genitive case: Inalienable possession: physical descriptions

18.   *Typovyja Hermany byli* **blakitnych abo šèrych vačèj**

'Typical Germans had blue or grey eyes [lit. '**were blue.GEN or grey.GEN eyes.GEN'**].'

Corrected into:
3 out of 9: *meli*
2 out of 9: *u typovych Hermanaǔ*
1 out of 9: *u ich byli* or *meli*
2 out of 9: *byli z blakitnymi*

---

[106] This means, that six informants out of nine (the total amount of persons, who have fulfilled the questionnaire), have corrected the highlighted construction into another. In this case, they have corrected *ja maju bjadu* into *u mjane bjada.*

4) *U* + GENITIVE

U + Gen.: Inanimate possession

19.   ***U zvyčajnych staloŭ** čatyry nožki*

   'Usually, tables have [lit. 'at tables.GEN'] four legs'

   Corrected into:
   1 out of 3: ***majuc' čatyry nožki***

20.   ***U muzeja byŭ** admyslovy pakoj-sejf z masiŭnymi kratami na vonkach.*

   'The museum had **[lit. 'at museum.GEN (there) was']** a special safe-room, with massive bars on the windows'

   Corrected into:
   2 out of 9: ***u muzei** '*in the museum'
   1 out of 9: *u muzeja* 'at the museum' is possible, but is far better ***u muzei*** 'in the museum'

U + Gen. in BKI constructions

21.   *Mėta dasjahnuta: usim davedzena – Daŭhalevič na dadzeny moment sjadzic' u lazni I zbiraecca neŭzabave vyjsci,* ***pic' u jaho bol'š njama z kim i njama čaho.***

   'The aim has been reached. Now everyone knows, that Daŭhalevič now is in the sauna and he is about to go out, because **he has nothing more to drink and no-one more to drink with'.**

   Corrected into:
   2 out of 9:unacceptable, to be corrected into ***jamu*** 'him.DAT'
   1 out of 9: acceptable, ***jamu*** 'him.DAT' is also possible
   1 out of 9: one must say either *pic'* ***jamu*** *njama* ***z kim i njama čaho*** or ***pic' u jaho*** *njama* ***čaho i*** *njama* ***z kim***

5) *Z* + INSTRUMENTAL

Z + Instr.: Inalienable possession: physical descriptions

22.   *U svjatlicu zajšoŭ vajavoda Vislavus. Ën* ***byŭ z karotkaj baradoj i sinimi vačyma**, jaščė malady, ale trymaŭsja pavažna, jak pažyly bayaryn.*

   'Voevod Vislavus entered in the chamber. He had a short beard and blue eyes [lit. '**he was with short beard and blue eyes'**], still young, but he behaved seriously, like an old boyar.'

   Corrected into:
   1 out of 9: ***ën meŭ karotkuju baradu***
   2 out of 9: ***u jaho byla karotkaja barada***

23. *U peršyja dni listapada ŭ špital' prybyli dva pacyenty z pastrėl'nymi ranami:* **adzin starejšy byŭ z peralamanaj kuljaj rukoj,** *druhi-ž, chlapec hadoŭ 14,* **z prastrėl'naj nahoj.**

'In the first days of November two patients with gunfire injuries arrived to the hospital: the oldest one had an arm [lit. '**he was with arm'**] broken by a bullet, the second, a guy aged around fourteen, had a shot leg [lit. **'he was with shot leg'**].

Remarks:
1 out of 9: the sentence is good, but it would also be possible to say **u starejšaha...**

Z + Instrumental: ownership

24. *U 50-ja hady ŭse bahatyja Italijcy* **byli z tryma chatami***: adna ŭ harach, druhaja na mory, y trecjaja ŭ horadze*

'In the fifties, all rich Italians had [lit.**'were with'**] three houses: the one in the mountains, another at the seaside, and a third in the town.'

Corrected into:
3 out of 10: **meli pa try chaty**

B. Lithuanian questionnaire

1) GENITIVE CASE

'Topicalised genitive': ownership

25. *Egidijus Sipavičius sako, kad koncertuodamas užsienyje turtų nesusikrovė, šis darbas jam tik padėjo nenuskursti pačiu sunkiausiu metu, kai dauguma Lietuvoje pasilikusių muzikantų nusigyveno.* **Dainininko šiandien automobilis, garažas,** *susitvarkė butą.*

'Egidijus Sipavičius said, that his concerts abroad have not made him rich. This work has just helped him in avoiding poverty in the most difficult time, when most of the singers, who remained in Lithuania, ruined themselves. Nowadays the singer has a car **[lit. 'singer.GEN** (is) car'], **a garage,** he has bought an apartment'

All informants have marked this sentence as incorrect.
Corrected into:
14 out of 21: *dainininkas* **turi**
3 out of 21: *dainininkui* **priklauso** 'to the singer (they) belong'
3 out of 21: *dainininkas* **susitvarkė** *automobilį* 'the singer has bought..'
1 out of 21: **dainininko garaže** *yra automobilis* 'in the singer's garage there is a car'

26. *Pasak kalėjimo viršininko J.Andželos, "Henytė", kaip ir kiti laukiantieji teismo, keliasi 6, o miegoti eina 22 val.* **Mafijos boso du televizoriai,** *kasdien skaito spaudą.*

'According to the director of the prison, J. Andžela, "Henytė", just like the other prisoners, who are waiting for their trial, gets up at six a.m., and he goes to bed at ten p.m.. The mafia boss has two televisions [lit. '**to the boss.DAT (are) two televisions'**], he reads the press every day.'

20/21 informants marked the sentence as incorrect
Corrected into:
17 out of 21: *mafijos bosas* **turi**
1 out of 21: *mafijos bosui* **priklauso** 'to the boss (they) belong'
1 out of 21: *mafijos bosas* **žiuri du televisorius** 'the boss watches two televisions'

2) DATIVE CASE

Dative case: ownership

27. *Ta statistika skelbia, kaip gyvena paprastas slovakas: beveik* **visoms Slovakijos šeimoms - televizorius, kas antrai – telefonas.**

    'This statistics conveys information about the life of a simple Slovak: almost all Slovak families [lit. '**almost to all Slovak families.DAT']** have a television, one family out of two has the telephone.'

    18/20 informants marked the sentence as incorrect
    Corrected into:
    11 out of 20: **turi**
    Others**: yra duotas, tenka televizorius** 'a television is given, is assigned', **visose Slovakijos Seimose yra televzorius** 'in all Slovak families there is a television'

28. *Įvažiavome į kalėjimo teritoriją ir užėjome pas budėtojus. Namelio viduje dirba du žmonės, reguliuojantys judėjimą iš ir į kalėjimą.* **Kiekvienam yra kompiuteris.**

    'We entered the territory of the prison and we went to the employees on duty. Two persons work in a little house, they regulate the traffic to and from the prison. Each one of them has [lit. **'to each one.DAT is'**] a computer'

    All informants marked the sentence as incorrect
    Corrected into:
    14 out of 21: *kiekvienas* **turi**
    3 out of 21: **kiekvienam yra skirtas** *televizorius* 'each one of them is given a television'
    2 out of 21: **kiekviename kambaryje** *yra televizorius* 'in each room there is a television'

29. *Egidijus Sipavičius sako, kad koncertuodamas užsienyje turtų nesusikrovė, šis darbas jam tik padėjo nenuskursti pačiu sunkiausiu metu, kai dauguma Lietuvoje pasilikusių muzikantų nusigyveno.* **Šiandien dainininkui yra automobilis, garažas, susitvarkė butą.**

    'Egidijus Sipavičius said, that his concerts abroad have not made him rich. This work has just helped him in avoiding poverty in the most difficult time, when most of the singers, who remained in Lithuania, ruined themselves. Nowadays the singer has a car **[lit. 'to singer.DAT** (is) car'], **a garage,** he has bought an apartment'

    7/7 informants marked as incorrect and proposed instead *turėti*.

Dative case: Moral characteristics

30. *Moters žodžiai aišku rodė, **kad jai buvo jautri, poetiška siela**, kuriai gyvenime skirta kentėti.*

'The words of the woman clearly show, that she has **[lit. 'to her (is')']** a bright, poetical soul, that is destined to suffer in life'

All informants marked the sentence as incorrect
Corrected into:
13 out of 21: ***ji buvo jautri siela*** 'she was a bright soul (Nom.)'
3 out of 21***: ji buvo jautrios sielos*** 'she was of a bright soul'
2 out of 21: ***tai buvo*** *jautri siela* 'this was a bright soul'
1 out of 21: *ji **turėjo** jautrį sielą* 'she had a bright soul'

Dative case → Inalienable possession: Physical characteristics

31. *Tai nebuvo tik paprastas kelmas. Jis tik iš viršaus taip negražiai atrodė, o jo vidury gyveno Strubuliukas, toks mažytis mažytis vyrukas. **Jam plaukai buvo geltoni,** apie ausis pasiraitę.*

'This was not just a normal cabin. From the outside, it looked like really ugly, but Strubuliukas, a little little man, lived inside it. His hair was yellow [lit. 'to **him.DAT hair was yellow'**], cut about the ears.'

19/21 informants marked this sentence as incorrect
Corrected into:
18 out of 21: ***jo plaukai*** *buvo geltoni* 'his hair was yellow'

Dative case → Social inalienable possession

32. *Laimėjau paskelbtą konkursą į neblogas pareigas vienoje firmoje. Jau ir darbo sutartį užpildžiau. Bet kai firmos direktorė moteris perskaitė, **kad man yra keturi vaikai**, net aiktelėjo. Ir dar pridūrė: "Bet jie tokie maži..."*

'I succeeded the selection for a good place in a company. I had even already signed the contract. But when the director – a woman - of the company read, that I have [lit. 'to me.DAT are'] four children, sighed. And she added: "But they are so little…"'

All informants marked the sentence as incorrect
Corrected into:
18 out of 21: ***aš turiu...*** 'I have'

Dative case → Social alienable possession

33. *Paulius iš Vilniaus jau septintą mėnesį gyvena amerikiečių šeimoje. Viename pirmųjų savo laiškų rašo, **kad jam labai daug draugų.***

'Paulius from Vilnius lives already since seven months by an America family. In one of his first letters he writes, that he has many friends [lit. 'to him.DAT are']'.

All informants marked the sentence as incorrect.
Corrected into:
16 out of 20: *jis turi* labai daug draugų**…**
4 out of 20: *jis susirado* labai daug draugų … 'he found many friends'

Dative case → Inanimate possession (descriptions)

34. *Pas mus dabar labai nepatogu gyventi, visada šalta.* ***Namui sulaužytas stogas...***

'At us it is very uncomfortable now, it is always cold. The house has a broken roof [lit**. 'to the house.DAT broken roof']**

All informants marked the sentence as incorrect
Corrected into:
16 out of 20: ***namo stogas (yra) sulaužytas (/sulužęs)****...* 'the roof of the house is broken (has got broken)
2 out of 20*: **namie** sulaužytas stogas* 'in the house the roof is broken'
1 out of 20: *namas **sulaužytu stogu*** 'the house (is) with broken roof → has a broken roof'

35. ***Mūsų namui*** *– raudonas stogas, baltos sienos, žalios langinės….*

'Our house has a red roof [, white walls, green shutters…'

17/20 informants marked the sentence as incorrect
Corrected into:
7 out of 20: ***musu namo raudonas stogas*** 'the roof of our house is red' (topicalised genitive)
3 out of 20*: **musu namo stogas** yra raudonas* 'the roof of our house is red'
2 out of 20*: musu namas **raudonu stogu*** 'our house is (with) red roof'
2 out of 20: *musu namas **su raudonu stogu*** 'our house is with red roof'
2 out of 20: *musu namas **turi** raudoną stogą* 'our house has a red roof'

Dative case → Abstract possession

36. *Vaikas - tokia pati individualybė ir asmenybė kaip ir mes, suaugusieji. Galbūt dar sudėtingesnė ir komplikuotesnė.* ***Jam taip pat yra rūpesčiai.***

'The child – is the same individuality and personality as we, the adults, are. Maybe even more complicated. He [lit. '**to him'**] has worries, too.

All informants marked the sentence as incorrect.
18 out of 20**: *jis turi…***
2 out of 20***: jam kyla rūpesčių* '**worries occur to him'

3) TURĖTI

Turėti → Inanimate possession

37. *Paprastai,* **stalai Lietuvoje turi keturias kojas***, dažnai beržines arba ąžuolines*

'Usually, tables in Lithuania have four legs, often of birch or oak'

All informants accepted this sentence. One proposed also the variant with the comitative adjunct: **stalai yra su keturiomis kojomis**

Turėti→ Inalienable possession: Physical characteristics

38. *Tai tau norėjo pasakyti panelė, su kuria tu gana trumpai šokai. Ji vilkėjo žalsvai rusvo atspalvio megztinį bei rudus džinsus,* **turėjo tamsius, banguotus plaukus ir mėlynas akis**

'This is want a girl, with whom you danced shortly, would like to tell you. She had a green-brownish sweater and brown jeans, **she had dark, wavy hair and blue eyes'**

9/20 informants marked the sentence as incorrect
Corrected into:
5 out of 20: **jos plaukai** *buvo tamsūs ir jos akys mėlynos* 'her hair was dark and her eyes blue'
4 out of 20: *ji buvo* **tamsių, banguotų plaukų** 'she was of dark, curly hair…'
1 out of 20*: ji* **garbanuotais plaukais** (Instrumenatl case: lit. 'she curly hair.INS')
1 out of 20: *ji buvo* **tamsiaplaukė garbanuotais plaukais** [lit. 'she was a brunette curly hair.INS]

Turėti → Physical possession

39. *Egle, niekur negaliu rasti knygos apie Veneciją kurią nusipirkom prieš menėsį. ..ar nežinai, kur ji yra? - Taip, žinau.* **Ją turi Povilas**

'Egle, I cannot find anywhere the book about Venice that we have bought a month ago…do you anyidea, where it is? – Yes, I know. Paul has it.'

2 out of 20 informants marked the sentence as incorrect, and both corrected it with *pas***: *ji pas Povilą**

4) PAS + ACC.

Pas + Acc. → Alienable permanent possession

40. *Paskutiniojo "Teleloto" papildomą prizą – automobilį "Ford Escort" laimėjo 22 m. kaunietė Rasa Repšytė. Kaip sakė Rasa, ji net negalvoja parduoti automobilio, kadangi* **pas ją jau seniai vairuotojo pažymėjimas** *ir labai nori su šiuo puikiu "Ford Escort" važinėti.*

'The last prize of "Teleloto" – a car "Ford Escort" - has been won by the 22-years-old Rasa Repšytė, from Kaunas. Rasa said, that she does not even think of selling the car, because

she already has [lit. '**at her.GEN is'**] the driver's license since a long time and she really wants to drive in this nice "Ford Escort".'

All informants but one, who considered the usage of *pas* acceptable, marked the sentence as incorrect and proposed instead *turėti*.

Pas + Acc. → Physical/ Temporary possession

41. *Atsiprašau, **ar pas Jus nėra žiebtuvėlio** cigaretei uždegti?*

    'Excuse-me, do you have a lighter to light a cigarette?'

    All informants marked the sentence as incorrect and proposed instead *turėti*.
    One informant proposed the variant with *turėti*, but did not reject the variant with *pas*.

42. "*Vilniaus troleibusų" generalinis direktorius teigė, kad nuolat ieškoma būdų, kaip sumažinti "zuikių" skaičių. Galvojama apie kontrolinį troleibusą, važinėjantį po visą miestą. Tarp stotelių jis aplenktų su keleiviais važiuojantį troleibusą, jį sustabdytų ir patikrintų keleivių bilietus. **Visi, pas kuriuos yra bilietai,** važiuotų toliau, o be bilietų - eitų pėsčiomis.*

    'The general director of the Vilnius tram service claimed, that they are constantly looking for a way of reducing the number of non-paying passengers. They have thought about a control tram, that would drive around the town. It would overtake a tram with passengers in it, stop it and control the passengers' tickets. All those, who have [lit. '**at whom.ACC are'**] tickets, can drive further, the others would have to go by feet.'

    15/19 informants marked the sentence as incorrect
    Corrected into:
    14 out of 19: *visi, kurie **turi** bilietus…*
    1 out of 19: *kas **su bilietais*** ['who is with the tickets…]

Pas + Acc. → Abstract possession

43. *Tyrimų metu profesorių labiausiai nustebinę tai, kad nerasta jokio ryšio tarp jaunimo psichosocialinių sutrikimų, skurdo ir nedarbo. Daugelis knygos komentatorių darė esminę klaidą: jie visiškai nesuprato, kad pokyčiai per tam tikrą laiko tarpsnį yra viena, bet visai kas kita, **kodėl pas vieną asmenį yra problemos**, o pas kitą – ne.*

    'The thing that mostly surprised the professors during the researches was, that they could not find any connection between psychosocial disorders, poverty and unemployment among young people. Most of those, who commented on this book, did a fundamental mistake. They did not understand, that the analysis of the [social] changes in a given length of time is not enough to explain, why one person has problems [lit. '**at one person are problems'**], while another does not.'

    14/18 informants marked the sentence as incorrect. 11 informants proposed the variant with *turėti*.

Pas + Acc. → Inalienable possession: Physical permanent characteristics

44. *Tai yra laisvi vaikai, neturintys to socialinio anstspaudo, kuriuo pažymėti musų internatų vaikai.* **Pas juos šviesūs veidai ir gyvos akys,** *jie pilni idėjų, pakankamai savarankiškai, išradingi.*

    'These are free children, without that social prejudice that marks out the children in our orphanages. They have [lit. **'at them.ACC (are]'**] bright faces, lively eyes, they are full of ideas, independent enough, resourceful.'

    16/21 informants marked the sentence as incorrect
    Corrected into:
    6 out of 21**: *jų* *šviesūs veidai ir gyvos akys* (topicalised genitive)
    6 out of 21: *jie* ***šviesaus veido ir gyvų akių*** 'they are of bright face and lively eyes'
    3 out of 21**: *jų veidai* *šviesūs* 'their faces are bright..'
    4 out of 21: *jie turi* *šviesius veidus* 'they have bright faces'

Pas + Acc. → Inalienable possession: Diseaes

45. *Dovile, ar tu važiuosi į Romą rytoj? - Deja ne,* **pas sūnų gripa,** *negalime išvažiuoti.*

    'Dovilė, are you going to Rome tomorrow? –Hélas, no, my son has the flue [lit. 'at son.ACC flue'], we cannot leave'

    17/19 informants marked the sentence as incorrect
    Corrected into:
    12 out of 19: *sūnus* ***serga*** *gripu* 'my son is ill with flu'
    6 out of 19: ***sūnui*** *gripas* (with dative case 'to the son is flu')

5) SU + Instr.

Su + Instrumental → Inalienable possession: Moral characteristics

46. *Ema - paprasta moteris.* **Bet ji su didele ir gera širdimi.** *Maža pasakyti gera - auksine, neišmatuojama žodžiais. Ji - tikra močiutė, mama,globėja.*

    'Ema is a simple woman. But she has a big and good heart [lit. 'she (is) with big and good heart']. It is even not enough to say 'good'- it is a golden heart, there are no words to describe it. She is a real mama, a mother, a tutoress.'

    16/21 informants marked the sentence as incorrect.
    Corrected into:
    10 out of 21: *ji* ***turi*** *didelę ir gerą širdį*
    3 out of 21: ***ji didelės ir geros širdies*** ['she is of big and good heart']
    3 out of 21**: *jos širdis* *didelė ir gera* **'**her heart is big and good'

Su + Instrumental → Inalienable possession: physical characteristics

47. *Tai buvo lasivi vaikai, neturintys to socialinio antspaudo, kuriuo pažymėti musų internatų vaikai.* ***Jie buvo su šviesiais veidais, gyvomis akomis,*** *jie buvo pilni idėjų, pakankamai savarankiški, išradingi.*

'These were free children, without that social prejudice that marks out the children in our orphanages. They had [lit. '**they were with'**] bright faces, lively eyes, they were full of ideas, independent enough, resourceful.'

16/19 informants marked the sentence as incorrect
Corrected into:
7 out of 19**:** *jie buvo **šviesių veidų*** 'they were of bright faces…'
6 out of 19: *jie buvo **šviesiais veidais*** (without *su*, with plain Instrumental)
2 out of 20**: *jų veidai*** *buvo šviesūs* 'their faces were bright..'
1 out of 20: *jie **turėjo** šviesius veidus* 'they had bright faces'

48. *Netrukus į ligoninę išvežti šios moters pagimdyti mažyliai.* ***Vienas vaikas buvo su sulaužyta ranka, kitas - su sužeistais pirštais***

'Shortly thereafter, the children of this woman were brought to the hospital. One child had a broken arm, the other had injured fingers [lit. 'child was with broken arm, the other with injured fingers'].'

14/20 informants marked the sentence as incorrect
Corrected into:
5 out of 20: ***vienam vaikui*** *buvo sulaužyta ranka* [lit. 'to one child.DAT was broken arm']
5 out of 20: ***vienas vaikas buvo sulaužyta ranka*** (without *su*, with plain Instrumental)
2 out of 20**: *vienas vaikas susilaužęs ranką*** 'a child had broken his arm'
2 out of 20: ***vieno vaiko.GEN ranka*** *buvo sulaužyta* **'**the arm of one child was broken'

Acknowledgements

References

Adomavičiutė, I., Čekmonas, V. 1991 Paradigma kvaziperfetnych form na –*(f)šy* v "pol'ščizne vilenskoj", in: Rieger, J., Werenicza, W. (eds.) *Studia nad polszczyzną kresową,* T.VI. Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków: Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk, 95-105

Andersen, H. 2006 Periphrastic futures in Slavic. Divergences and Convergences. in: Eksell, K., Vinther, T. (eds.) *Change in verbal System. Issues on Explanation,* Frankfurt am Main/ Berlin/ Bern/ Bruxelles/ New York/ Oxford/ Wien: Peter Lang, 9-45

Arutjunova, N.D., Širjaev, E.N. 1983 *Russkoe predloženie: bytijnyj tip (struktura i značenie).* Moskva: Russkij jazyk

Baldi, P., Cuzzolin, P. 2005 Considerazioni etimologiche, areali e tipologiche dei verbi di "avere" nelle lingue indoeuropee, in: Kiss, S., Mondin, L., Salvi, G. (eds.) *Latin et langues romanes*, Tübingen:Max Niemeyer, 26-36

Balode, L., Holvoet, A. 2001 The Lithuanian language and its dialects, in: Dahl, Ö., Koptjevskaja-Tamm, M. *Circum-Baltic languages. Vol.1: Past and Present*, [SLCS], Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 41-80

Baron, I., Herslund, M. 2001a Dimensions of Possession. Introduction, in: Baron, I., Herslund, M. (eds.) *Dimensions of Possession,* Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1-26

Baron, I., Herslund, M. 2001b Semantics of the verb HAVE, in: Baron, I., Herslund, M. (eds.) *Dimensions of Possession,* Amsterdam: Benjamins, 85-98

Bauer, B. 2000. *Archaic Syntax in Indo-European. The Spread of Transitivity in Latin and French*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter

Belaruskaja hramatyka. II. *Sintaksis*. 1986, Minsk: Navuka i technika,

Benveniste, É. 1966 "Être" et "avoir" dans leurs fonctions linguistiques, in: *Problèmes de Linguistique générale*, Paris: Gallimard, 140-148

Bernštejn, S.B. 1974 *Očerk sravnitel'noj grammatiki slavjanskich jazykov*, Moskva: Nauka

Besters-Dilger, J., Drobnjakovič, A. and Hansen, B. 2009, "Modals in Slavonic languages", in: Hansen, B. and De Haan, F. (eds.) *Modals in the languages of Europe* (Empirical approaches to language typology 44.) Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 167-197.

Bieder, H. 2000 Die weissrussische Standardsprache am Ende des 20.Jahrhunderts, in: Zybatow, L. (ed.) *Sprachwandel in der Slavia. Die slavischen Sprachen an der Schwelle zum 21. Jahrhundert*, Frankfurt a.M: Peter Lang, 653-665

Birnbaum, H. 1979 *Common Slavic*, Columbus, OH: Slavica Publishers

Brižakova, E., Konoplina, E., Petrova, Z. (eds.) 1997 *Slovar' russkogo jazyka XVIII veka*, vol. 9, Moskva:Nauka

Brugmann, K. 1922. *Kurze vergleichende Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Berlin: de Gruyter

Bybee, J., Revere, D.P., Pagliuca, W. 1994 *The Evolution of Grammar: tense, aspect, and modality in the languages of the world,* Chicago: Chicago University Press

Bušljakoŭ, Ju., Vjačorka, V., San'ko, Z., Saŭka, Z. 2005 *Belaruski kljasičny pravapis*, http://pravapis.info/books/pravapis2005.html

Chappell, H., McGregor W. 1996 Prolegomena to a theory of inalienability, in: Chappell, H., McGregor W. (eds.) *The grammar of inalienability: a typological perspective on body part terms and the part-whole relation*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 3-30

Clancy, Steven J. 2010 *The Chain of Being and Having in Slavic* [Studies in Language Companion Series 122], Philadelphia/Amsterdam: John Benjamins

Clark, E.V. 1978 Locationals: Existential, Locative and Possessive Constructions, in: Greenberg, J.H. *Universals of Human Language,* Vol.4*: Syntax,* Stanford: Stanford University press, 85-126

Čekmonas, V. 1988 *Vvedenie v slavjanskuju filologiju*, Vilnius: Mokslas

Čekmonas, V. 2001 Russian varieties in the southeastern Baltic area: Urban Russian of the 19th century, in: Dahl, Ö., Koptjevskaja-Tamm, M. *Circum-Baltic languages. Vol.1: Past and Present*, [SLCS], Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 101-136

Činčlej, K. 1990 *Tipologija kategorii posessivnosti*, Kišenëv [Chişinău]*:* Stiinca

Danylenko, A. 2002 The East Slavic 'HAVE': Revising a Developmental Scenario, in: Jones-Bley, K., Huld, M.E., Della Volpe, A., Robbins Dexter, M. Proceedings of the Thirteen Annual Conference of the UCLA, Los Angeles 2001, *Journal of the Indoeuropean Studies Monograph Series No.44,* 105-128

Danylenko, A. 2005 Is there any possessive perfect in North Russian?, *Word* 56,3, 347-379

Danylenko, A. 2006, On the name(s) of the *prostaja mova* in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth", *Studia Slavica Hung.* 51/1-2, 97-121

Dini, P.U. 1997 *Le lingue baltiche*, , Firenze: La Nuova Italia

Edel'man, J.I. 1975 Les verbes 'être' et 'avoir' dans les langues iraniennes, in: Bader, F. et al. (eds.), *Mélanges linguistiques offerts à Émile Benveniste*, Louvain: Peeters, 151-158.

Evans, N.D. 1995 *A Grammar of Kayardild*, Berlin:Mouton de Gruyter

Filin, F.P. 1972 *Proischoždenie russkogo, ukrainskogo i belorusskogo jazykov*. Istoriko-dialektologičekij očerk, Leningrad [Santk Petersburg]: Nauka,

Fraenkel, E. 1929 *Syntax der litauischen Postpositionen und Präpositionen*, Heidelberg: Winter

Garde, P. 1976. Analyse de la tournure russe *mne nečego delat'. International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics* 22, 43–60

Geniušienė, E.Š., Nedjalkov V.P.1988 Resultative, Passive, and perfect in Lithuanian, in: Nedjalkov, V.P (ed.) *Typology of Resultative Constructions*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam –Philadelphia, 369-386

Guiraud-Weber, M., Mikaeljan, I 2004 V zaščitu glagola imet', in: Apresjan, Ju.D. *Sokrovennye smysly. Slovo.Tekst.Kul'tura. Sbornik statej v čest' N.D.Arutjunovoj*, Moskva: Jazyki slavjanksoj kul'tury, 54-68

Gutschmidt, K. 2000 Sprachenpolitik und sprachliche Situation in Weißrußland seit 1989 in: Panzer, B.(ed.) *Die sprachliche Situation in der Slavia zehn Jahre nach der Wende. Beiträge zum Internationalen Symposion*

des Slavischen Instituts der Universität Heidelberg vom 29. September bis 2. Oktober 1999 [Heidelberger Publikationen zur Slavistik, 10], Frankfurt/M., Berlin, Bern, Bruxelles, New York, Oxford, Wien: Peter Lang, 67-84

Hansen, B. 2001, *Das slavische Modalauxiliar – Semantik und Grammatikalisierung Im Russischen, Polnischen,Serbischen/Kroatischen und Altkirchenslavischen.* München: Verlag Otto Sagner

Hansen, B. 2003. The grammaticalization (and degrammaticalization?) of modals in Slavonic, in Berger, T., Gutschmidt, K. (eds.) *Funktionale Beschreibung slavischer Sprachen. Deutsche Beiträge zum 13. Internationalen Slavistenkongress in Ljubljana*, München, 91-107

Haspelmath, M. 2001 The European linguistic area: Standard Average European. In: Haspelmath, M., König, E., Oesterreicher, W., Raible, W. (eds.)*Language typology and language universals.* (Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft) Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1492-1510

Haspelmath, M. 1999 External possession in a European areal perspective, in: Payne, D., Barshi, I. (eds.) *External Possession*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 109–135

Heine, B. 1997 *Possession: Cognitive sources, forces and grammaticalization*, Cambridge: Cambridge University press

Heine, B., Kuteva, K. 2006 *The Changing languages of Europe*, New York: Oxford University Press,

Hentschel, G., Zaprudski, Siarhej (eds.) 2008: *Belarusian Trasjanka and Ukrainian Suržyk: Structural and social aspects of their description and categorization. Beiträge zum gleichnamigen "Thematischen Block" auf dem Internationalen Slavistentag in Ohrid, Mazedonien 2008*. (= Studia Slavica Oldenburgensia 17), Oldenburg

Holvoet, A. 1999 Infinitival relative clauses in Baltic and Slavonic, *Baltistica* XXXIV(1), 37-53

Holvoet, A. 2001a Zur Variation des possessiven Dativs mit dem adnominalen Genitiv im Baltischen, besonders im Lettischen. In: W. Boeder & G. Hentschel, eds., *Variierende Markierung von Nominalgruppen in Sprachen unterschiedlichen Typs*, Oldenburg: Bibliotheks- und Informationssystem der Universität Oldenburg, 201-217 (Studia Slavica Oldenburgensia 4), Oldenburg, 215-224

Holvoet, A. 2001b Gibt es im Slavischen infinitivische Relativsätze? Zum Satztyp poln. *Nie ma co robić*, russ. *nečego delat'*, in: In: V.S. Chrakovskij, M. Grochowski, G. Hentschel, eds., *Studies on the Syntax and Semantics of Slavonic Languages*. Oldenburg: Bibliotheks- und Informationssystem der Universität Oldenburg, 215-224. (Studia Slavica Oldenburgensia 9), 215-224

Holvoet, A. 2003a Notes on possessive constructions in Baltic, in: Ostrovski, N., Vaičiulitė-Romančuk, O. (eds) *Prace bałtystyczne*, 36-44

Holvoet, A. 2003b Modal constructions with 'be' and the infinitive in Slavonic and Baltic, *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* 48, 4, 465–480

Holvoet, A. 2005a Intranzitivinių sakinių tipai: egzistenciniai, lokatiniviniai ir posesyviniai sakiniai, in: Holvoet, A, Judžentis, A., Mikulskas, R. *Gramatinių funkcijų tyrimai. Lietuvių kalbos gramatikos darbai 3*, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas, 139-160

Holvoet, A. 2005b Attributive and predicative possession: some cases of ambiguity in Baltic and Slavonic, *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* 50, 58-67

Holvoet, A. 2007 *Mood and Modality in Baltic*, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego,

Isačenko, A.S 1974 On 'Have' and 'Be' Languages, in: M. Flier, (ed.) *Slavic Forum: Esseys in Linguistics and Literature,* The Hague-Paris: Mouton de Gruyter, 43-77

Ivanov, V.V., Toporov, B.N. 1958 *K postanovke voprosa o drevnejšych otnošenijach baltijskich i slavjanskich jazykov*, IV Meždunarodny s''ezd slavistov, Doklady, Moskva

Jung, H. 2010 Innovations in the rise of the dative-infinitive modal sentence in Russian, *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* 55, 4, 377-399

Kalnyn', L.Ė, Mološnaja, T.N. (eds.) 1986 *Problemy dialektologii. Kategorija posessivnosti*, Moskva: Nauka

Karski, Ja. 1956a [1911] *Belorusy. Jazyk belorusskogo naroda*, II, 2, Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR

Karski, Ja.1956b [1911] *Belorusy. Jazyk belorusskogo naroda*, III, 3, Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR

König, E, Haspelmath, M. 1997 Les constructions à possesseur externe dans les langues d'Europe, in: Feuillet, J. (ed.) *Actance et valence dans les langues d'Europe*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 525-606

Koptjevskaja-Tamm, M., Wälchli, B. 2001 The Circum-Baltic languages: An areal-typological approach, in: Dahl, Ö., Koptjevskaja-Tamm, M. *Circum-Baltic languages. Vol.2: Grammar and Typology*, [SLCS], Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 615-750

Kordić, S. 1999 *Der Relativsatz im Serbokroatischen*, Newcastle: Lincom Europa [Studies in Slavic Linguistic 10]

Krivickij, A.A., Padlužny, A.I. 1994 *Učebnik belorusskogo jazyka dlja samoobrazovanija*, Minsk: Vyšejšaja Škola

Kurz, J. 1969 *Učebnice jazyka staroslověnského*, Praha: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství

Kushko, N. 2007 Literary Standard of the Rusyn Language: the Historical Context and Contemporary Situation, *Slavic and East European Journal*, 51,1, 111-132.

Langacker, R. 1991 *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar, Vol.1,* Stanford: Stanford University Press

Langacker, R. 1994, The limits of continuity, in: Fuchs, C. and Victorri, V. (eds.), *Continuity in Linguistic Semantics*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 9-20

Langacker, R. 2000 *Grammar and conceptualization*, Berlin/New York : Mouton de Gruyter

Langacker, R. 2002 *Concept, Image and Symbol. The Cognitive Basis of Grammar.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter

Langacker, R. 2009 *Investigations in Cognitive Grammar*, Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter

Le Feuvre, C., Petit, D. 2011 Être et avoir en slave et en baltique, *Lalies*, 31, 253-277

Lempp, A. 1986, *Mieć. To have in modern Polish.* München: Otto Sagner

Lomtev, T.P. 1956a *Grammatika belorusskogo jayzka*, Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe učebno-pedagogičeskoe izdatel'stvo,

Lomtev, T.P 1956b *Očerki po istoričeskomu sintaksisu russkogo jazyka,* Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo Universiteta

Lyons, J. 1968 *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Lyons, J. 1977 *Semantics.Vol.2*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Maskuliūnas, B. 2000 *Posesyvumo raiška XVI-XVII a. lietuvių rašto paminkluose,* Ph.D.Dissertation (published: id. 2005, *Senieji lietuvių raštai I : archajinės posesyvinės formos ir konstrukcijos*, Šiauliai: Šiaulių universiteto leidykla)

Mathiassen, T. 1985 A discussion of the notion 'Sprachbund' and its application in the case of the languages in the Eastern Baltic area. *International Journal of Slavic Philology* 21-22, 273-281

Mayo, P. 1975 Recent development in the norms of the byelorussian literary language, *The Journal of Byelorussian studies*, III, 3, 244-268

Mayo, P. 1978 Byelorussian orthography: from the 1933 reform to the present day, *The Journal of Byelorussian studies*, IV, 2, 25-47

Maroz, S.S. 2001 *Katehoryja pasesiŭnasci i srodki jae vyražennja ŭ sučasnaj belaruskaj litaraturnaj move*, Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Pedahahičny Universitėt imja Maksima Tanka, Minsk

Mazzitelli, L.M. 2011 Possession, modality and beyond: The case of *mec'* and *mecca* in Belarusian, in: Nomachi, M. (ed.) *Grammaticalization in Slavic Languages: From Areal and Typological Perspectives. Revised and Enlarged Edition* [Slavic and Eurasian Studies 23], Sapporo: Slavic Research Center of the Hokkaido University, 179-202

McAnallen, J. 2011 Predicative Possession in the Old Church Slavic Bible translations, in: Welo, E. (ed.) *Indo-European syntax and pragmatics: contrastive approaches*, University of Oslo: Oslo, http://www.journals.uio.no/osla

McMillin, A.B. 1966 XIXth century attitudes to Byelorussian before Karski, *Journal of Byelorussian Studies,* I, 2, 103-109

Meillet, A. 1924 *Le slave commun*, Paris: Librairie ancienne Honoré Champion

Miller, G.A., Johnson-Laird, P.N. 1976 *Language and perception*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Mikaelian, I. 2002 *La Possession en russe moderne. Éléments pour la construction d'une catégorie sématico-syntaxique*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Aix-en-Provence

Mirčev, K. 1971 Predlog *u* v possessivnoj funkcii v istorii bolgarskogo jazyka, *Issledovanija po slavjanskomu jazykoznaniju*, 79-84

Mrázek, R. 1990 *Sravnitel'nyi sintaksis slavjanskich literaturnych jazykov. Ischodnye struktury prostogo predloženija*, Brno: Univerzita J. E. Purkyně

Nadsan, A, Naša Niva, *Journal of Byelorussian Studies,* I, 3, 184-206

Narkevič, A.I. 1972 *Sistema slovaslučennjaŭ sučasnaj belaruskaj move*, Minsk: Vydavectva BDU imja U.I Lenina

Payne, D., Barshi, I. 1999 External possession: What, Where, How and Why, in: Payne, D., Barshi, I. (eds.) *External Possession*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 3-32.

Payne, D. 2009 Is possession mere location? Contrary evidence from Maa, in: McGregor, W. B (ed.) *The expression of Possession*, Berlin-New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 105-142

Porayski-Pomsta, J., Čekmonas, V.N. (eds.) 1999 *Sytuacja językowa na Wileńszczyźnie*, Warszawa: Elipsa

Prochorova. S.M. 1991 *Sintaksis perechodnoj russko-belorusskoj zony: areal'no-typologičeskie issledovanija*, Minsk: Universitetskoe

Orr, R. 1992 Slavico-Celtica, *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 34, 3, 245-268

Rappaport, G. 1986 On a Persistent Problem of Russian Syntax: Sentences of the Type *Mne negde spat'*. *Russian Linguistics* 10, 1, 1-31

Rudin, C. 1985 *Aspects of Bulgarian Syntax: Complementizers and wh-Constructions*, Columbus, OH: Slavica Publishers

Safarewiczowa, H. 1964 *Oboczność* ja imeju *i* u menja est' *w języku rosyjskim dziś i dawniej*, Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków: Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk

Sawicki, L. 2011 The perfect-like construction in colloquial Polish, *Zeitschrift für Slawistik,* 56, 1, 66-83

Sjameško, L. 1995 Prablemy norm i kadyfikacii belaruskaj litaraturnaj movy, in: Gajda, S. *Języki słowiańskie 1945-1995.Grammatyka-Leksyka-Odmiany. Materialy międzynarodowej konferencji naukowej, Opole 20-22-09.1995* r., Opole: Wydawnictwo Św. Krzyża, 21-28

Seiler, H. 1983, *Possession as an operational dimension of language*, Tübingen: Narr

Seliverstova, O.N 2004 [1975; 1990] *Trudy po semantike*, Moskva: Jazyki slavjanskoj kul'tury

Senn, A. 1929 *Kleine litauische Sprachlehre*, Heidelberg: Julius Groos

Senn, A. 1966 The Relationship of Baltic and Slavic Ancient Indo-European Dialects, in: Birnbaum, H., Puhvel, J. (eds.) *Proceedings of the Conference on Indo-European Linguistics*, Berkley, Los Angeles: University of California Press, 139-151

Sipovič, Č. 1973 The language problem in the Catholic Church in Byelorussia from 1832 to the first World War, *Journal of Byelorussian Studies*, III, 1 3-40

Shevelov, G.Y 1974 Belorussian versus Ukrainian: Delimitation of texts before A.D. 1569, *Journal of Byelorussian Studies,* III, 2, 145-156

Šolienė, A. 2012 Epistemic Necessity in a Parallel corpus: Lithuanian vs. English, in: Usonienė, A., Nau, N., Dabašinskienė, I. (eds.) *Multiple Perspectives in Linguistic Research on Baltic Languages*, Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 10-42

Stang, C. 1935 *Die westrussische Kanzleisprache des Großfürstertums Litauen*, Oslo: Dybwad

Stassen, L. 2009 *Predicative Possession,* New York: Oxford University Press

Stolz, T. 1991 Sprachbund im Baltikum? *Estnisch und Lettisch im zentrum einer sprachlischen Konvergenzlandschaft* [Bochum-Essener beiträge zur Sprachwandelforschung 13], Bochum: Brockmeyer

Šakun, L. 1960 *Narysy history belaruskaj litaraturnaj movy*, Minsk: Dzjaržaŭnae vučebna-pedahahičnae vydavectva Ministerstva Asvety BSSR

Šarić, L. 2002 On the semantics of the "dative of possession" in the Slavic languages: An analysis on the basis of Russian, Polish, Croatian/Serbian and Slovenian examples, *The Slavic and East European Language Resource Center,* 3 http://www.seelrc.org/glossos/issues/3/saric.pdf

Šuba, P. 1993 *Tlumačal'ny sloŭnik belaruskich prynazoŭnikaŭ*, Minsk: Narodnaja Asveta (http://slounik.org/prynaz/)

Šukys, J. 1998 *Lietuvių kalbos linksniai ir prielinksniai: vartosena ir normos*, Kaunas: Šviesa

Taylor, J. R. 1996 *Possessives in English. An exploration in cognitive grammar*, Oxford: Clarendon press

Tham, S.W. (submitted to *Language;* presently under review) A conceptual (re)interpretation of the possessor-as-location hypothesis (http://www.wellesley.edu/EALL/stham/papers/possloc.pdf)

Vaillant, A. 1950 *Grammaire comparées des langues slaves*. Tome I., Lyon: IAC

Vaillant, A. 1977 *Grammaire comparées des langues slaves*. Tome V, Paris: Klincksieck

Vasilev, C. 1973 Ist die Konstruktion 'u menja est'' russisch oder urslavisch?, *Die Welt der Slaven* 181, 361-367

Veenker, W. 1967 *Die Frage des finnougrischen Substrats in der russichen Sprache* [Uralic and Altaic Series 82], Bloomington: Indiana University Press

Vykypěl, B. 2001 Zwei lettonistische Bemerkungen, in: Šefčík, O., Vykypěl, *B. Grammaticus. Studia linguistica Adolfo Erharto quinque et septuagenario oblata*, Brno: Masarykova Universita, 211-223

Watkins, C. 1967 Remarks on the genitive, in: *To Honor Roman Jakobson.Eassays on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*, vol. 3, The Hague:Mouton de Gruyter, 2191-2198

Waring, A.G. 1980 The influence of non-linguistic factors on the rise and fall of the old Byelorussian literary language, *Journal of Byelorussian Studies*, IV, 3-4,129-147

Weiss, D. 1999 Ob odnom predloge, sdelavšem blestjaščuju kar'eru (Vopros o vozmožnom agentivnom značenii sodeli "*u* + imjarod"), in: *Tipologija i teorija jazyka. Ot opisanija k ob"jasneniju (sbornik v čest' A.E.Kibrika*), Moskva, 173-186

Wiemer, B. 2003a Dialect and language contacts on the territory of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania from the 15th until 1939, in: Braunmüller, K., Ferraresi, G. *Aspects of Multilingualism in European Language history*, Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 105-143

Wiemer, B. 2003b Zur Verbindung dialektologischer, soziolinguistischer und typologischer Methoden in der Sprachkontaktforschung (am Beispiel slavischer und litauischer Varietäten in Nordostpolen, Litauen und Weissrussland), *Zeitschrift für Slawistik*, 48,1, 212-229

Wiemer, B. 2004 Population linguistics on a micro-scale. Lessons to be learnt from Baltic and Slavic dialects in contact, in: Kortmann, B. (ed.) *Dialectology meets Typology. Dialect Grammat from a Cross-Linguistic perspective*, Berlin-New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 497-256

Wiemer, B., Giger, M. 2005 *Resultativa in den nordslavischen und baltischen Sprachen* [LINCOM Studies in Language Typology 10], Munich: Lincom

Zielińska, A. 2004 *Mowa prosta* und andere Begriffe aus dem Vokabular des Forschers in der slavisch-baltischen Kontaktzone, *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* 49,3, 297-307

Zinkevičius, Z. 1996 *The History of the Lithuanian language*, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla

Zolotova, G.A. 2006 *Sintaksičeskij slovar'. Repertuar elementarnych edinic russkogo jazyka,* Moskva: Nauka

Žuraŭski, A. 1998 Destruktyŭnyja ŭhily ŭ sučasnaj belaruskaj move, in: *Belaruskaja mova ŭ druhoj palove XX stahoddzja: Materyjaly mižnarodnaj navukovaj kanferencyi* (22-24 kastryčnika 1997), Minsk

.